FBIS DAILY REPORT

Soviet Union

CONTENTS

Vol III No 61 29 March 1978

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT & SALT

Soviet-U.S. Geneva Delegates Differ Over Neutron Bomb [Perevoshchikov in IZVESTIYA 23 Mar]	AA 1	1/A6
Study Group Proposed	AA 1	1/A6
USSR-U.S. Consultative Commission Opens in Geneva [PRAVDA 23 Mar]	AA 2	1/A7
Results of Nongovernmental Disarmament Meeting Reviewed [PRAVDA]	AA 2	1/A7

CSCE/MBFR

Belgrade Said to 'Benefit' Cause of Peace, Detente [PRAVDA Editorial Article 25 Mar]	BB 1	1/A8

GENERAL

Editorial Repeats Soviet Offer of Talks on Neutron Bomb [Editorial in IZVESTIYA 23 Mar]	A 1	1/A12
Soviet Parliamentary Delegation Leaves for Lisbon Session	A 3	1/A14
Meeting Opens	A 3	1/A14
Novikov Addresses Moscow Soviet Meeting on Olympics	A 3	1/A14

UNITED STATES

Arbatov Expresses Concern Over USSR-U.S. Relations [PRAVDA 28 Mar]	B 1	1/B1
McGovern, Others Favor Speedy Conclusion of SALT Pact [Yuryev in PRAVDA 24 Mar]	B 6	1/B6
Carter Begins S. America-Africa Tour, Seeks U.S. Dominance [Levin]	B 7	1/B7
Arrival in Caracas	B 8	1/B8
End of Cuban Blockade Requested	B 8	1/B8
Nicaraguan Letter to Carter	B 8	1/B8
Anti-American Sentiments Persist in Latin America [Bay in IZVESTIYA 23 Mar]	B 8	1/B8
Senate 'Shackles' Panama Canal Treaty With Amendments [Rusakov in PRAVDA 23 Mar]	B 9	1/B9
Under Secretary of State Leaves for Turkey, UK, FRG	B 10	1/B10
Propaganda Cannot Hide U.S. 'Complicity' With Israel [Kolesnichenko in PRAVDA 25 Mar]	B 10	1/B10
Negotiations Continue With Allies on Neutron Bomb	B 11	1/B11
America Asked To 'Bury' Plans for Neutron Bomb [Kozhevnikov in IZVESTIYA]	B 11	1/B11
Pentagon's Indian Ocean Designs Threaten Peace, Security [Baykov in PRAVDA 23 Mar]	B 12	1/B12

CHINA

PEOPLE'S DAILY Comment, Discord Among PRC Leaders Scored [Mulatov] C 1 1/B13
PRC Science Conference, Status of Scientists Examined [Churin] C 2 1/B14
Teng Masterminds Pincer Attack Against Soviet Union C 3 1/C1
PRC Minister's Radio Address Claims Threat to Scandinavia [Chernyshov] C 3 1/C1

EAST EUROPE

SFRY's Minic Arrives in Moscow for Talks, Met by Gromyko D 1 1/C2
Gromyko, Minic Discuss Issues D 1 1/C2
Received by Brezhnev D 1 1/C2
Minic Presents Tito Message [TANJUG] D 2 1/C3
Brezhnev Positively Assesses Message [TANJUG] D 2 1/C3
Report on Talks [TANJUG] D 3 1/C4
Departs USSR For Home D 3 1/C4
USSR General Yepishev Welcomes CSSR Counterpart [Prague] D 4 1/C5
Ustinov Receives Delegation [Prague] D 4 1/C5
CEMA Foreign Trade Session Opens in Sofia D 4 1/C5

WEST EUROPE & CANADA

Red Brigades, Secret Services Linked in Italian Kidnaping [Gratsianov] E 1 1/C6
Moro Kidnaping Aimed to Cause 'Tension and Fear' [Prozhogin in PRAVDA 24 Mar] E 2 1/C7
PCF Plea of 'Unjust' French Election System Cited [Volodin in IZVESTIYA 22 Mar] E 2 1/C7
Soviet Policy Toward West Berlin Expounded E 3 1/C8

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Saudi King Reportedly Cables Carter on Dollar F 1 1/C10
Begin Suggests Resumption of Talks With Egypt F 1 1/C10
Continuing Material on Israeli Move Into Lebanon F 1 1/C10
Israeli Troop Concentration F 1 1/C10
UN Troop Deployment [Geyvandov in PRAVDA 27 Mar] F 2 1/C11
USSR Relief Supplies F 3 1/C12
Israeli Goals [Demchenko] F 3 1/C12
Israeli Genocide [Kudryavtsev in IZVESTIYA 22 Mar] F 4 1/C13
Damascus Conference Communique [PRAVDA 22 Mar] F 6 1/D1

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Rhodesian Internal Settlement Rejected by Neighbor States [Dolgov] H 1 1/D2
African Press Comment H 1 1/D2
Front Leader Interviewed [Logov] H 2 1/D3
Nigerian Envoy Requests Sanctions Against S. Africa H 3 1/D4
U.S. Capital Heavily Entrenched in South Africa H 3 1/D4

Imperialists, Reactionaries Still Trying to Split Ethiopia H 4 1/D5
Chad Government, FROLINAT Hold Talks in Libya H 4 1/D5

NORTHEAST ASIA

USSR-DPRK Cultural Agreement Signed in Moscow [Petrov] M 1 1/D6
JCP Opposition to U.S. Military Construction Noted M 1 1/D6

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Brezhnev Departs for Tour of Siberia, Soviet Far East R 1 1/D7
Report on Kosygin's 22-24 Mar Visit to Tyumen, Tomsk [PRAVDA 25 Mar] R 1 1/D7
Anniversary of Gorkiy's Birth Observed in Moscow R 1 1/D7

APR 1 4 1978

Item 856-B-8 PrEx 7.10:FBIS-SOV-78-61

FBIS-SOV-78-61
Wednesday
29 March 1978
Vol III No 61

Contr

DAILY REPORT

COMPLETED

ORIGINAL

SOVIET UNION

Available for Distribution
From NTIS

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

50

This publication contains current news and commentary monitored by FBIS from foreign broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, and periodicals. Items are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign-language sources are translated by FBIS. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS. Labels such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how FBIS processed the information from the original. Names rendered phonetically or in transliteration are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clearly heard but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

Users of this publication may cite FBIS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying it as the secondary source. For example: "FBIS reports that Radio Moscow announced . . ." or "FBIS has monitored a broadcast from Hanoi which says . . ."

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

SOVIET, U.S. GENEVA DELEGATES DIFFER OVER NEUTRON BOMB

LD281417Y Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Mar 78 Morning Edition p 4 LD

[K. Perevoshchikov dispatch: "The Latest Session"]

[Text] Geneva--The Disarmament Committee is continuing its work in Geneva. V. I. Likhachev, the representative of the Soviet Union, addressed the latest session and gave an analysis of the committee's activity over its entire existence.

The Soviet representative noted that the draft agreements, conventions and treaties drawn up earlier have become effective instruments for curbing the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race.

Together with the Soviet-U.S. accords on preventing nuclear war, strategic arms limitation and certain others, the USSR representative noted, they now constitute the most substantial part of the international agreements on disarmament.

The Soviet Union and the socialist countries which are members of the committee came forward on 9 March with a new initiative--a draft convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of neutron weapons. Participating in the discussion of this draft, U.S. representative A. Fisher defended the idea of the production, deployment and use of neutron weapons. He tried to divert the attention of the members of the committee away from the discussion of the problem by talking about the imagined "military superiority" of the Soviet Union. The head of the British delegation also spoke in the same vein as the U.S. representative.

Study Group Proposed

LD282110Y Moscow TASS in English 1927 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Geneva, March 28, TASS--The Disarmament Committee in Geneva is discussing problems of prohibition of the development and production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. The Soviet Union is known to have tabled at the committee's last summer session a draft agreement on prohibition of the development and production of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

The development of events most convincingly reaffirms the importance and timeliness of this initiative, said the USSR's representative, Victor Likhachev, speaking at the committee's plenary meeting today. Over this period the problem has not become less acute. On the contrary, it grew more acute. The course of the present-day scientific-technical progress show that the successes in the sphere of fundamental knowledge and a high level of technology make bigger the probability of appearance of new types and systems of weapons.

The USSR is exerting and will be invariably exerting efforts to promote putting into life the pressing objective--prohibition of the development and production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, the Soviet representative stressed. To make the work of the committee on drafting the text of a comprehensive agreement on the matter more purposeful and thorough, he proposed to institute at the Disarmament Committee a group of qualified government experts to study possible directions of development of new types of weapons of mass destruction, subject to inclusion into the preliminary list of such weapons to be prohibited in accordance with the comprehensive agreement.

USSR-U.S. CONSULTATIVE COMMISSION OPENS IN GENEVA

LD281351Y Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Mar 78 p 4 LD

[Text] Geneva, 22 March TASS--A session of the Soviet-U.S. Standing Consultative Commission opened here today. The commission is called upon to help realize the aims and provisions of the treaty limiting ABM systems and the interim agreement on certain measures concerning the limitation of strategic offensive arms concluded between the USSR and the United States on 26 May 1972, as well as the agreement on measures to reduce the risk of outbreak of nuclear war concluded between the two countries on 30 September 1971.

RESULTS OF NONGOVERNMENTAL DISARMAMENT MEETING REVIEWED

LD220900Y Moscow TASS in English 0722 GMT 22 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Moscow, March 22, TASS--Summing up the results of the Geneva conference of non-governmental organizations on disarmament, PRAVDA writes, the conclusion can be drawn with utmost certainty: Disarmament increasingly becomes a vital matter of the peoples, their organizations and movements. Mighty forces are on the side of disarmament. In the struggle for disarmament, mutual understanding is growing and cooperation of all really peace-loving forces is expanding. The conference in Geneva, the article runs, proved a possibility of elaborating a joint realistic approach of different socio-political forces to solution of one of the most acute and complex questions of the present, their readiness and ability to collectively elaborate constructive positions.

The Geneva conference was also unanimous in the question of the new monstrous weapon of death--neutron bomb, PRAVDA writes. The demand to prevent neutron bomb development was voiced in most of the speeches, in a message to a special session of the U.N. General Assembly, in reports of all four commissions. This opinion of the representative international forum, just as thousands of other actions of protest in countries of all continents, cannot but be taken into account by those who simultaneously, with the opening of the U.N. General Assembly's session on disarmament, intend to hold another NATO meeting in Washington to further the solution of the question of deployment of neutron warheads in Western Europe.

BELGRADE SAID TO 'BENEFIT' CAUSE OF PEACE, DETENTE

LD281117Y Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Mar 78 p 4 LD

[Text] On 9 March the Belgrade meeting of representatives of states which participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe finished its work. As stipulated by the final act, the meeting was convened to continue the process started at Helsinki so as to assist in strengthening peace on the continent and the security of the peoples who inhabit it.

The Soviet Union, consistently implementing the 25th CPSU Congress' principled foreign policy line, proceeded on the basis that the main substance of the Belgrade meeting, as Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, noted, must be concern for peace and security in Europe and the development of cooperation among the European peoples, and that in this connection agreement should be reached on some specific recommendations and proposals on the questions indicated.

On the whole, positive results were achieved at the Belgrade meeting. It demonstrated the determination of the European peoples to continue following the path started at Helsinki. The final document was adopted unanimously.

When submitting proposals on questions of security and cooperation at the Belgrade meeting, the Soviet Union took into account the fact that the most important and urgent problem for Europe today is consolidating the process of detente, adding military detente to political detente and adopting practical measures on disarmament.

The platform of action with the aim of consolidating military detente in Europe sketched out by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev aroused widespread interest at Belgrade. At the Belgrade meeting the Soviet Union and fraternal socialist countries actively advanced this realistic program which implies specific and effective steps aimed at averting war on the continent. As is known, it provides for the conclusion of a treaty among the participants in the all-European conference on not being the first to use nuclear weapons; the agreement not to expand by adding new members, the military-political groupings and alliances which oppose each other on the European Continent; the agreement not to conduct exercises involving the participation of more than 50,000-60,000 men; and the extension of the military confidence-building measures set out in the final act to countries located in the southern Mediterranean.

The Soviet side proposed the discussion in the immediate future of the entire range of problems connected with military detente and also of other possibly constructive proposals in this field at special consultations among all the conference participants. The great political significance of the Soviet Union's proposal to reach an agreement on mutually refraining from manufacturing the neutron bomb was emphasized at the meeting.

The adoption at the Belgrade meeting of the platform of action aimed at consolidating military detente in Europe and of the whole range of proposals concerning military detente would have had important significance for peace not only in Europe but also throughout the world.

However, the United States and some of its NATO allies turned down these proposals, thereby demonstrating complete indifference to the fundamental questions of insuring peace on the European Continent. The proposals submitted by the delegations of the United States and other NATO countries included none which would really lead to military detente and a reduction of military confrontation in Europe.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries at the Belgrade meeting submitted a whole range of proposals aimed at further developing cooperation among states.

In the political sphere the consolidation of detente was answered by the Soviet proposal on the adoption of additional measures to insure the personal security of representatives and citizens of one state on the territory of another and also security during cultural, sporting and other events. The USSR and Poland submitted a proposal on legislative enshrinement of the principles set out in the final act; the GDR submitted a proposal on implementing the final act by developing treaty relations in the political, economic and cultural spheres.

Important proposals aimed at developing the institution of political consultations among the states which participated in the conference were also submitted (by the GDR and Czechoslovakia) and on banning war propaganda or any use or threat of force (by Czechoslovakia).

In the economic sphere, the Soviet delegation proposed the adoption of recommendations that conferences or international meetings be convened as quickly as possible on questions of protecting the environment and on the power industry and transportation.

Proposals by the Polish delegation provided, for instance, for the acceptance of commitments by the states which participated in the Helsinki conference to accelerate the eradication of existing trade barriers and not to establish new obstacles in the way of trade and economic cooperation.

Proposals by Norway on the expansion of international cooperation to protect the environment, and by Austria on stepping up all-European cooperation in the power industry field and in connection with an all-European poan for the use of inland waterways were also interesting. Acute problems affecting the destinies of millions of people were raised in a proposal concerning migrant work forces.

In the sphere of humanitarian cooperation the socialist countries proposed a number of new initiativaes. Proposals were submitted on encouraging public meetings in defense of peace, security and friendship among peoples; on holding a forum of people's creativity (by the USSR) on cooperation in the field of education in the interests of peace (by Poland); on stepping up the activities of the mass media (by Czechoslovakia); on all-European cultural cooperation (by Romania); on declaring 1980 a year of European culture (by Yugoslavia) and others.

However, not everybody came to Belgrade for the purpose of drawing up practical recommendations aimed at consolidating security and developing cooperation in Europe.

Essentially taking a line against the Belgrade meeting's adoption of the proposals on important aspects of European security and cooperation, the United States resorted to obstructionist tactics and demagoguery about the human rights issue.

Of course, the Soviet Union has no reason to refuse to hold a serious discussion on the subject of human rights and their violation in the United States and other capitalist countries. It was precisely the USSR, which has built a society of mature socialism, which enshrined human rights in their practical implementation. Therefore the Soviet Union, in contrast to the propaganda ruses of its opponents, has openly come out and continues to come out for international cooperation in assisting the universal recognition and development of human rights throughout the world. Under the influence of the practice of the socialist countries, a concept in international law has been formed which has been recognized in the final act of the all-European conference and in a number of other international documents--the concept that the principle of human rights cannot be examined or applied in isolation from other basic principles of international law (noninterference in internal affairs, sovereign equality, the rights of the peoples to decide their own fate, and so forth), much less be set against these other principles.

At the Belgrade meeting the Bulgarian and GDR representatives suggested registering a recommendation concerning the ratification of international pacts on human rights by all states which took part in the conference. The Hungarian representatives stated that it should be recommended to participating states that they insure representatives suggested that they grant women equal rights with men.

But the U.S. delegation was not interested in the fate of the millions of its own citizens who suffer unemployment, social injustice, racial discrimination, gangsterism and other mass violations of human rights. Instead of displaying a serious approach to the observance of the principle of respect for human rights, the U.S. delegation sought to defend individual renegades who have betrayed their people and to use their unseemly deeds as a pretext for attempting to appropriate some sort of "right" to dictate to other states the laws and procedures they should have. That is, to legalize interference in the socialist countries' internal affairs and subversive activity from abroad, banned by both international law and, incidentally, by the domestic legislation of the United States itself.

In his statement submitted recently to the notorious Washington "Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe," A. Goldberg, head of the U.S. delegation, essentially admitted that his entire activity in Belgrade did in fact come down to a propaganda racket around the so-called "human rights" problems; other topics, including key problems of political and military detente, did not worry him at all. Giving himself away, the U.S. diplomat admitted that the aim of the U.S. delegation's unseemly activity was "to create an atmosphere which would push the Eastern countries to reassess their position" on internal issues. In other words--direct pressure and coercion brought to bear on sovereign states. These actions were aimed at distracting public opinion from the main issues of the day--the limitation of the arms race and disarmament--and concealing the fact that the United States is not prepared for a constructive discussion of realistic proposals.

These actions in fact meant the introduction of the means and methods of "psychological warfare" at the meeting in order to undermine the process of cooperation begun in Helsinki and to take a step backward--toward a resumption of confrontation. What could be more hypocritical than to don the garb of "defenders" of human rights and at the same time to plan the production of the neutron bomb, thus jeopardizing the paramount human right--the right to life!

The Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries have resolutely rebuffed those who like to interfere in internal affairs. It has been firmly stated that there can be no revision either of the final act and its provisions or of the main directions of the process of detente defined in Helsinki.

Together with the fraternal socialist countries and other states interested in reinforcing security and cooperation in Europe, the Soviet Union has made an important contribution to the attainment of the positive results of the Belgrade meeting. The neutral and nonalined states played a positive part. Mention should be made of Yugoslavia's useful contribution to the successful completion of the meeting.

The final document stresses the significance which those taking part in the meeting attach to the continuation of the process of detente, notes that the exchange of opinions on the agenda is a valuable contribution to the attainment of the goals defined by the all-European conference, and confirms the determination of the countries which took part to fulfill totally, unilaterally, bilaterally and multilaterally the provisions of the final act.

The document records the agreement to hold the next meeting in Madrid in November 1980. It was also agreed that three conferences of experts would be held before this meeting: on questions of examining and elaborating a universally acceptable method for the peaceful settlement of disputes, the preparation of a scientific forum, and cooperation in the Mediterranean in the economic, scientific and cultural spheres.

What are the main results of the Belgrade meeting?

First, it confirmed the trend toward the development of detente, which is making progress despite the resistance of its opponents.

Second, the experience of the Belgrade meeting convincingly showed the impossibility of combining serious efforts to resolve urgent international problems with interference in the internal affairs of other states.

Third, thanks to the resolute rebuff given to any attempts to destroy the balance of the Helsinki accords and distort the meaning of their content, the final act has not been weakened but has become still further embedded in the European political soil.

Fourth, the meeting outlined ways toward the continuation of the miltifaceted process of reinforcing security and developing cooperation in accordance with the final act.

The Belgrade meeting was benefitted the common cause of peace, security and detente.

EDITORIAL REPEATS SOVIET OFFER OF TALKS ON NEUTRON BOMB

LD281231Y Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Mar 78 Morning Edition p 1 LD

[Editorial: "Outlaw the Neutron Bomb"]

[Text] Soviet foreign policy and all of its actions proceed from the lofty aim of preserving and strengthening peace. Our party and state are doing everything to insure that the sky remains clear. At the same time they are vigilantly keeping an eye on the intrigues of the enemies of peace, resolutely opposing their malevolent plans, and giving mankind timely warnings about the danger of those plans.

The danger represented by the plans for the production of the neutron bomb in the United States and for its deployment in NATO countries is impossible to overestimate. The imperialist forces and militarist cliques intended to operate like conspirators: They were counting on completing this "operation" while keeping it secret from the world public. The following strategy was mapped out: Agreement was to be reached in a narrow circle of NATO leaders on producing the neutron bomb in the United States and deploying it in Western Europe. At the same time they wanted to pass off the neutron monster as a conventional reinforcement for the NATO arsenal. The word "bomb" itself was expunged from the vocabulary used in Western military headquarters and in the diplomatic offices, and instead it was given the tongue-twisting name of some kind of enhanced-radiation nuclear charge.

But it proved impossible to keep the inhuman schemes secret from mankind. And the people of the whole world are indebted for this to the Soviet Union and to its adherence to principle. At the end of last year, L.I. Brezhnev, answering questions from a PRAVDA correspondent, exposed the champions of the neutron bomb. "This inhuman weapon," L.I. Brezhnev declared, "which is especially dangerous because it is being passed off as a 'tactical' and almost 'innocent' weapon, is being persistently imposed upon the world. An attempt is thereby being made to blur the distinction between conventional and nuclear weapons and to make the transition to nuclear war pass unnoticed by the people. This is a veritable deceit; it is deception of the people."

The Soviet Union resolutely opposed the creation of the neutron bomb. At the same time it warned that, if this bomb were created in the West, the USSR would not remain a passive observer and would be faced with the need to respond to this challenge to insure the security of the Soviet people and of their allies and friends.

But we do not want new twists in the arms race, which has already reached vast proportions. The Soviet Union and the other socialist states are persistently and consistently striving for the solution of the problem of disarmament and are making practical proposals aimed at this.

In the case of the neutron bomb the Soviet state has not restricted itself to discussing the plans for its production or to warnings about the dangerous and inevitable consequences of such a step by the West. L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, has made a perfectly clear and concrete proposal: that agreement be reached on the mutual renunciation of the production of neutron weapons. And we stress--mutual renunciation. This proposal was conveyed to the U.S. leadership and to the governments of the NATO states and other West European countries. However, for the moment both Washington and the other Western capitals have preferred to remain silent.

On 9 March 1978, eight socialist countries--the USSR, Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Mongolia, Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia--submitted a draft convention on the prohibition of neutron weapons for the examination of the Geneva Disarmament Committee. The significance of this draft is that the neutron bomb should be outlawed. The discussion of the socialist countries' draft is still in its initial stage. However, this time certain representatives of the West, of the United States and Britain, for instance, hastened to express their opposition to the very idea of the proposed convention, alleging that it is impossible to detach the question of the neutron bomb from other problems of disarmament. At the very least their logic is odd: If the arms race has not yet been successfully halted, this means, they say, that obstacles must not be placed in the way of its intensification, in this instance, in the way of a qualitiatively new twist in the arms race--neutron bomb production.

The Soviet Union's resolute warning about the consequences of the production and deployment of the neutron bomb cannot be ignored even by the most militant circles in the United States and in other NATO countries. They are resorting to various maneuvers. The West European NATO members are not averse to taking refuge behind the following "position": Let the decision be made in Washington, since the production of the neutron bomb is being proposed in the United States. The United States is letting it be understood that it would like to receive a request, or at least the consent of its West European partners, for the deployment of neutron weapons before making a decision on the production of neutron weapons. "Trial balloons" of the following kind are also being sent up: What if the start of neutron weapons production is announced but its deployment in Western Europe is postponed for some time? Finally, there are attempts to make proposals--known to be unacceptable to the Soviet Union--that the ultimate decisions on the neutron bomb be linked with other questions quite irrlevant to the matter at hand.

All these tricks are aimed at deceiving the world public. They are being employed because the plans for the adoption of the neutron bomb as part of the NATO arsenal have caused awesome consequences for their authors. The movement against the neutron bomb has assumed an unprecedented scale. Tens of millions of ordinary people and the most diverse public organizations have joined this movement. International conferences with the motto "halt the neutron bomb!" are taking place one after another. A number of smaller NATO countries have declared their refusal to allow neutron weapons to be deployed on their territory.

However, despite everything, the United States and certain circles in other NATO countries are showing no readiness to abandon their plans. On the contrary, reports are coming in that indicate an intention to speed up the adoption of a decision on the question of neutron weapons.

Under these conditions the recent publication in a TASS statement of the Soviet Union's reaffirmation of its appeal to the United States for the mutual renunciation of the production of neutron weapons assumes special significance. The Soviet Government is prepared to start holding talks on this question at any time and to conclude an appropriate international agreement.

With each passing day the exacting voice of the people is ringing out increasingly loudly--outlaw the neutron bomb!

SOVIET PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION LEAVES FOR LISBON SESSION

LD250632Y Moscow in Portuguese to Portugal 2100 GMT 23 Mar 78 LD

[Text] A delegation from the USSR left for Lisbon, Portugal today. The delegation represents the Parliamentary Group of the USSR and is led by Vitaliy Ruben, deputy chairman of the Parliamentary Group of the USSR, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. The delegation is composed of deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet and will take part in the spring session of the Interparliamentary Union.

Meeting Opens

LD281007Y Moscow TASS in English 2007 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Lisbon, March 28, TASS--The spring session of the Interparliamentary Union was opened here today. It is attended by delegations from 75 countries. On the agenda are questions related to limitation of the arms race and disarmament, aid to developing countries, struggle for complete abolition of colonialism, etc.

The president of the Republic of Portugal, Antonio dos Santos Ramalho Eanes, welcomed the participants in the session of the Interparliamentary Union.

NOVIKOV ADDRESSES MOSCOW SOVIET MEETING ON OLYMPICS

LD241508Y Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 24 Mar 78 LD

[Text] A session of the Moscow Soviet today discussed the progress of preparations for the Olympic games. A report was delivered by Promyslov, chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom.

It was stressed at the session that the preparations for the Olympic games are closely linked with the capital's development and with the implementation of a broad program for improving labor conditions, services and leisure facilities for Muscovites. The deputies discussed in detail the tasks envisaged in the integrated plan for the Olympic games and examined matters pertaining to the work being done by public catering and trade enterprises, passenger transportation enterprises and cultural establishments. A great deal of attention was given to the construction and reconstruction of Olympic projects.

Novikov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the "Olympics-80" Organizing Committee, addressed the session.

ARBATOV EXPRESSES CONCERN OVER USSR-U.S. RELATIONS

AU291140Y Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 78 pp 4-5 AU

[Academician G. Arbatov article: "Time for Crucial Decisions"]

[Text] The state of and prospects for Soviet-American relations are now attracting much attention both by specialists and by the broad public. The main food for reflection is being provided, not by any new events or changes in their development, but rather by the lack of such changes and by the very fact that because of the policy pursued by the American side, the development of relations between these two countries has noticeably slowed down. One can also now form an opinion about the effects of such a slowdown. It is becoming increasingly evident in particular that the halts, marking time in settling outstanding problems in Soviet-American relations, are threatening not only a waste of valuable time, but also the emergence of new difficulties and backsliding.

This has its explanation. Detente is merely a few years old, while the preceding "cold war" lasted for several decades. The United States has inherited from those "cold war" decades, not only the ballast of prejudices and biases, but also a peculiar built-in mechanism of increasing tension. What is meant here are the arms race mechanisms, the U.S. military-political alliances and the apparatus of propaganda and subversive activity set up for "cold war" services. All these mechanisms are operating in a deliberate way--they are aggravating tension, whipping up military rivalry and kindling distrust and hatred for the "external enemy"--the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

These mechanisms are even stronger since the entire system of drive belts binds them with their entire social environment, with the interests and policy of the class ruling American society. Although the prospects for preventing a nuclear war, detente and the reform of relations between the USSR and the United States are now feasible, it does not mean that the power of monopolies has ceased to feed hostility toward socialism and to pursue imperialist expansion. The crux lies somewhere else--in the profound sociopolitical changes in the world, changes which have drawn firm limits for imperialist policy, as well as in the new realities of the nuclear age, which leave no acceptable alternative to peaceful coexistence.

It is precisely these changes which made it possible in the first half of the seventies to achieve important changes in relations between the two countries, changes that continue to seriously influence the situation. The entire series of agreements and treaties signed in those years formed the foundation that gave Soviet-American relations a stability which proves rather difficult to shake even for the most frantic adversaries of detente. The dialog started by the two countries is continuing. Talks are in progress on a whole range of topics, including those concerning arms limitation and military detente.

Yet is is necessary to face facts. Against the background of the halt in the settlement of important questions in Soviet-American relations caused by U.S. policy, the arms race, the creation of new, dangerous types and systems of weapons (for example, neutron weapons) and the growth of military allocations in the United States and other NATO countries are continuing at a high pace. To justify this course, a campaign is being launched to show a Soviet "military menace." The United States administration is joining the campaign with increasing frequency. Carter's recent speech at Wake Forest is one of the latest examples of this.

The existing difficulties also have other causes. The revival of chauvinist moods in America plays a significant role. One can view them partly as a reaction to a number of domestic political failures which overtook the United States, and partly, as a result of the illusion that the development of events could be reversed because, allegedly, the period of grave shocks in the United States was over and the country was emerging from the bitter economic crisis (the country has again run into serious economic troubles). One must not forget that since it is necessary to proceed from developing the general principles of relations between the two countries to the materialization of these principles and to their translation into concrete deeds, the very process of detente also calls for the settlement of ever more complex tasks. And these objective complications have been invariably used to arouse disappointments in detente itself.

Certainly this is only one side of the political situation that has emerged in the United States. One must not overlook the fact that recent years have not changed the vital national interests of the United States. Like the interests of any other country in the world, they continue to call for preventing a nuclear war, for reassigning the enormous sums and resources devoured by the arms race for more creative purposes and for developing mutually beneficial international cooperation. In the United States there are quite a few advocates of a policy that meet these interests. Recent speeches by R. Clark, E. Kennedy, L. Aspin, G. McGovern and other senators and congressmen, as well as by such prominent scientists and public figures as A. Harriman, G. Kennan, G. Kistyakovskiy, C. Yost and prominent representatives of business circles, were delivered in the spirit of detente. Most Americans--and this was also confirmed by recent public opinion polls--favor improving relations with the USSR and an agreement on arms limitation. The existence in the country of "strong strivings for detente with the Russians" is also being admitted, according to press reports, by responsible figures in the White House.

The political situation thus emerging in the United States is complex and not simple, and this must have a bearing on the settlement of questions on which the future of Soviet-American relations and of international relations as a whole largely depend.

I would like to deal at some length with one of them--the agreement on strategic arms limitation, because among outstanding problems involving Soviet-American relations this one is the most important and urgent.

As far as one can judge from what is known about the principles already agreed upon and under consideration in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, this agreement may become a major step in arms limitation. Also important is the fact that it will clear the way for a new stage in the talks, for more radical accords that will make it possible to advance further to the discontinuation of the strategic arms race and toward the significant reduction of such arms. In a word, as Comrade L.I. Brezhnev pointed out, the agreement would make a true breakthrough on the way to military detente. As of last September, as is known, work on the agreement has picked up, and there are only a few items on the agenda still to be decided. The American side has repeatedly made statements that this work could be finished within a couple of months, if not within weeks.

Yet the more real the prospects for the agreement, the more bitter the attacks against it by the opponents of detente. The critics of the agreement are trying to prove in advance that it would give unilateral advantages to the Soviet Union, that the United States has allegedly made unjustified concessions in the talks, and that the main principles of the agreement could not be controlled by national means and therefore were of little value. These critics are acting persistently and, one must admit, resourcefully. There are continuing speculations about intentional "leaks of information from the talks.

Uninformed people are being confused with technical details of the problems being discussed that are only understandable to specialists, and with references to "intelligence data" allegedly possessed by the United States (and which, by the very nature of their source, no one can check).

We will not now go into specific evidence presented by the adversaries of the agreement. PRAVDA recently published an editorial closely examining questions related to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks and giving a well-reasoned reply to those who distort the essence of these questions and try to undermine confidence in an agreement in order to hinder the process of its elaboration and of its subsequent ratification. This makes it possible to concentrate on the political side of the matter.

The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks have now reached a distinctive landmark. Certainly, a number of essential problems and many technical details still remain open. But the possibility of reaching agreement on them, as well as the very fate of the agreement, seem today to depend not so much on the skill of those engaged in the talks as on the principled decision of the U.S. Government--whether the agreement will be concluded at all. One cannot shake off the impression that Washington has again entered a period of vacillation [kolebaniya] precisely on this vital question; again, since one chance of reaching an agreement has already been missed because of such vacillations (this has been admitted by some representatives of the former administration who recall, not without regret, the peripeteia of the 1976 electoral campaign, when the attempts to appease the rightwing by sacrificing the agreement not only failed to insure victory for the Republicans, but also contributed to their defeat).

How are these new vacillations to be explained?

A number of leading figures of the administration have recently made statements on this subject, making the fate of the agreement dependent on developments in the area of the Horn of Africa. Such a "linkage" [uvyazka] met with criticism even in the United States. It was pointed out in particular that it was completely irrelevant in this case, since the matter in question was an agreement in which both sides were equally interested, and not a peculiar bonus for the Soviet Union. Certainly, some American figures put the question more flexibly, maintaining that the government does not link an agreement in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks with the events in Africa, but only warn that they would affect the political atmosphere, rendering the ratification of the future agreement even more difficult or even impossible. But this does not stand up to criticism.

But of course no one would begin to dispute the importance of the general political situation. However, it is also obvious that the course taken by a government is no passive object, but an important instrument for shaping this situation. And if the conflict in the African Horn was instrumental in charging international tension, then surely it was caused by Somalia's aggression against Ethiopia. However, Somalia would scarcely have ventured to carry out such aggression had it had no grounds to count on U.S. support. Probably even the United States was associating this adventure with certain calculations. But is it logical to try to take revenge for unsound calculations, making it more difficult to solve questions in which America is no less interested than the Soviet Union?

Naturally the events in Africa are far from the only question the United States is citing as the cause of the deterioration in the atmosphere of Soviet-American relations. There are other questions, too, both real and false, blown up by propaganda (such as the notorious question of the alleged violations of "human rights" tolerated by the Soviet Union). Without delving deeper into the substance of each of these matters, we would merely like to recall that in undertaking the large and laborious work of improving Soviet-American relations the two sides could not but understand from the very beginning that they are separated both by radical ideological and social differences and by their approaches to many international questions. (Let us recall at least the fact that at that very moment the aggression in Vietnam was in full swing and that the Mideast situation was also most dangerous). All this had to influence the political atmosphere. What could be done? Was one to wait until all the political storms had abated, until the differences were solved in some unknown way, and nothing clouded the atmosphere? [paragraph continues]

Had the USSR and the United States taken such a position, the two countries would undoubtedly have remained to this very day on the brink of a "cold war", which would merely have become even more dangerous.

Detente became possible precisely because another approach was chosen--to seek, even in complicated circumstances, paths toward some arrangement on the main, decisive problems of the two powers' mutual relations. This path has proved to be successful. A number of important agreements were concluded, and this was of great significance for the further development of relations between the USSR and the United States, for the normalization of the entire international situation.

But let us revert to the SALT agreement. Even if we attribute the U.S. vacillations [kolebaniya] on this matter to the political atmosphere, nevertheless the main role in its deterioration is played by the continuing arms race and by the freezing of military detente itself--this central question in USSR-U.S. relations; that is, by problems directly connected with strategic arms. These problems--or, more precisely, the direction taken by the debates around them, which are now taking place in the United States--are complicating the situation to a considerable extent.

The deliberations are centered on the same old argument about the "Soviet threat," which for decades has been used to further the arms race. It is openly claimed that this "threat" is allegedly engendered by...the Soviet policy of securing military supremacy. The groundlessness of this version is obvious. Both at the strategic level, and in the area of the so-called "central contraposition" [protivostoyaniye]--a parity has been established in Europe, an approximate equality, and this has been acknowledged time and again even in official statements of the U.S. leadership. As can be seen, the crux of the matter lies elsewhere completely--in the unwillingness to reconcile oneself to this equality, in the stubborn aspiration of the U.S. imperialist circles to achieve military supremacy. From this arises the dissatisfaction with the future agreement, the heightened concern that it could cement the correlation of strategic forces to the disadvantage of the United States.

At the same time, frequent attempts are made to present the agreement as the source of those dangers that are actually engendered by the very existence of enormous amounts of mass destruction weapons. Naturally it is not easy to reconcile oneself to the idea that oneself, one's family, one's country would be vulnerable--in the event of war--to a nuclear strike, bringing with it death and monstrous destruction. Perhaps it is particularly difficult for the Americans to become accustomed to this, when, for centuries they have been living beyond two oceans with a feeling of complete security and, if one thinks of the postwar years, with the conviction of their own strategic supremacy (and they lived, to tell the truth, without being embarrassed in any way by the fact that such "security," such supremacy was becoming an enormous danger to other people).

The real dangers lie not in agreements on a limitation of strategic arms, not in the mutual concessions that one must make in order to reach a mutually acceptable compromise--they lie in the arms race itself. They lie in the fact that the world is living on mountains of mass destruction weapons and that the process of their production is not slowing down. Scientific-technical progress is opening up possibilities for creating increasingly dangerous arms, and the United States is exploiting these possibilities, becoming the outrider for ever more rounds of this race. Under these conditions no one can have absolute security. In the meantime there are more tasks on the agenda--to reduce the scale of the threat, to avert the danger of war, to prevent new rounds of the arms race. These aims are extremely importnat, since they mark the only realistic road to consolidating peace and safeguarding international security. And the Soviet-American agreement now being worked out would signify a great step on this road.

There are quite a few people in the U.S. Congress who understand these truths very well. But there are others there also. That is why one can expect that even if this agreement is concluded, its ratification by Congress will require an involved struggle. It is quite probable that one of the causes of the hesitation manifested by the U.S. administration is precisely the fact that it has not yet resolved the question of whether it is now prepared to enter such a struggle.

It can be presumed that this is the foundation of the calculations made by the opponents of the agreement--by complicating the situation in Congress they are trying not only to make the ratification more difficult, but also to increase the government's hesitation, thus dragging out the talks themselves indefinitely. However, here the same question arises: Why, indeed, does the administration not take advantage of possibilities it undoubtedly has at its disposal to influence the situation? Surely these possibilities are particularly significant in precisely those instances involving the limiting of strategic armaments. In the discussions now being conducted beyond the ocean, no one can answer the critics of the agreement with greater authority or disperse the existing doubts and clearly and accurately portray the true state of affairs than the American Government.

And it is hard to suppose that this is not being done (or being done all too rarely) by oversight, or through someone's negligence. It is rather a matter of ambivalence in the administration's policy, beginning with the fact that it is attempting to combine the arms limitation negotiations with the creation of new and dangerous types of weapons and with increasing demands for military allocations. One would think that it is precisely this ambivalence that is forcing the administration to remain silent on certain occasions, to enter into dangerous compromises with its critics in various matters, and at times to play into their hands. The impression is being created that such a line is also linked with attempts to utilize the situation in the United States, and also the increased attacks on the future agreement, to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet Union during the negotiations and to "haggle" for unilateral concessions. Such an approach can hardly be considered a far-sighted one.

It seems that even the Bible says: There is a time for casting away stones, and a time for gathering them in. In the course of preparing any agreement there is also a time for voicing doubts, for diplomatic maneuvers. And there also comes a time when it is finally necessary to decide: Should the agreement be reached, or should it not.

The entire logic of the development of events leads us to conclude that such a moment is indeed drawing near. Its responsibility is determined by the fact that it will not be a question of just another agreement that is to be decided. It is actually a question of choosing the path for years to come. It can be either an agreement that can be the starting point for further progress in the direction of limiting and reducing arms and of developing mutually advantageous, peaceful cooperation, or it can be a rejection of an arrangement, which would mean a break-down of the Soviet-American dialog on key questions of the two powers' security, of international security, and a marked deterioration in the general atmosphere in USSR-U.S. relations.

The time has come to match [soizmeryat] the agreement that is being worked out with exactly this choice. In expressing certain pretensions with regard to the agreement, one should particularly reflect on whether matters would be improved, were this agreement not to exist at all (and this, actually, refers to the concern, rather widespread in the United States, over the vulnerability of intercontinental ground-based missiles, about the difficulties of controlling the implementation of the agreement and so forth. [paragraph continues]

Such an approach would also help to better appraise [otsenit] the agreement as a whole. Recently, Senator R. Clark convincingly pointed out the grave consequences of a breakdown in the agreement--new and absolutely unlimited rounds of the arms race, the growth of military spending, the spreading of nuclear arms, the destabilization of the strategic situation, an increased tension in political relations. And, as a result of all this--the increasing threat of war.

In this connection let us once again recall President J. Carter's Wake Forest speech. This speech reiterates assurances to the effect that "the main concern" of the United States remains the prevention of a nuclear war, that America would strive to bring the SALT negotiations to a successful end and that it would not seek unilateral advantages. Yet the main emphasis in this speech is placed on strident promises to strengthen the military might of the United States, develop [razvertyvat] new weapons systems, referring to the "Soviet threat" and the USSR's "sinister intentions."

How are these remarks to be interpreted? As a shift in political accents? As a return to the "policy of strength?" As attempts to obtain military superiority, a policy which invariably failed throughout the entire postwar period? How can one reconcile this with "concern" for preventing war? Today the danger of war is engendered precisely by the arms race. Let us not forget that certain new trends are now evident in the development of military technology. The specialists are still arguing about them. Yet one thing is evident: The arms race will become even more dangerous because the new types and systems of weapons will shake even the relative stability that exists today. The next 15-20 years could, in this sense, seriously differ from the preceding period.

Of course, one can impose new rounds in the arms race on the other side. This has happened more than once, and the Soviet Union proved that it can neither be intimidated nor forced to retreat when confronted with such actions. Yet, Washington, too, should stop and consider all the consequences of such a policy, and how it will affect both the interests of the United States and those of all mankind.

The time is truly coming for crucial decisions in Soviet-American relations. The course elaborated by the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses remains the immutable foundation of Soviet foreign policy. This course also includes an improvement in Soviet-American relations and an enhancement of the positive changes in these relations that made themselves felt in the first half of the seventies. All this was again clearly noted at the recent session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, during the deliberations on the results of the trip of the Supreme Soviet to the United States. Taking the floor at this session, Comrade L.I. Brezhnev stressed that a period has come in the development of Soviet-American relations which necessitates the exertion of new efforts to impart dynamism and a more constructive character to these relations.

The direction which the development of relations between the two countries will take does not depend on the Soviet Union alone. The immediate future must show whether Washington, in effect, adheres to the tenets that have been repeatedly proclaimed recently by the American leadership: tenets for strengthening peace, limiting and reducing arms and for promoting cooperation with the USSR.

MCGOVERN, OTHERS FAVOR SPEEDY CONCLUSION OF SALT PACT

LD281349Y Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Mar 78 p 5 LD

[Georgiy Yuryev report: "Sensible Opinions"]

[Text] However the notorious U.S. "hawks" may strive to resurrect the cold war, the resistance offered by sane-minded circles is being preserved and strengthened. Keen debates are also underway in Congress. [paragraph continues]

The obdurate champions of cold war are opposed by realistic figures who advocate preserving and reinforcing detente and developing mutually advantageous cooperation with the USSR and the other socialist countries, and in particular, reaching agreement as soon as possible on strategic arms limitation.

This was convincingly demonstrated by Senator McGovern's thorough report, published in Washington under the title "Detente and the New U.S. Administration," submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This report is based on materials collected by McGovern in 1977 on behalf of this committee and on documents which he received as the Senate's consultant attached to the U.S. delegation at the SALT talks now underway in Geneva.

In this report Senator McGovern rejects what he terms the "nightmarish" description of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries by the opponents of detente. He rejects the myth that the USSR and its allies are threatening the United States or anyone else. As for the SALT talks, the Senator says that "more than any other area of diplomacy, they should be treated, not as a means of attaining a comparative advantage over the Soviet Union, but as a process which should benefit both sides. The decision to spend millions of dollars on new weapons cannot be regarded as a favor to the U.S. people."

Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Sparkman and Senator Pell, a member of the same committee, expressed the same spirit and, on the basis of Secretary of State Vance's report to the Senate, rejected the malicious, slanderous allegations made by former Defense Secretary Laird and others to the effect that the USSR is "violating" the agreements it has concluded and that it "cannot be trusted."

In an interview with U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, Paul Warnke, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, recently expressed his support for the speediest conclusion of a new strategic arms limitation treaty.

The future will show whether these sensible opinions will actually be reflected in U.S. policy.

CARTER BEGINS S. AMERICAN-AFRICA TOUR, SEEKS U.S. DOMINANCE

LD282006Y Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[From the International Diary program presented by Viktor Levin]

[Text] President Carter of the United States today began a weeklong tour of a number of South American and African countries. His first stop will be Venezuela. Carter will later go to Brazil, Nigeria and make a short stop in Monrovia, the capital of Liberia.

U.S. news agencies report that the president will discuss relations between industrial and developing states during this trip. However, there is no doubt that, in keeping with White House policy, these talks will parallel the relationship between a rider and horse. The United States--as it is easy to guess--will assume the role of rider.

The president's visit should be considered in the context of Washington's overall policy. This policy is determined by the efforts of American monopolies to consolidate their positions in the developing countries and to oppose the growth of the national liberation movement.

Arrival in Caracas

LD282318Y Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1853 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Caracas, 28 March--U.S. President J. Carter arrived here on an official visit today. He will discuss a number of international and regional problems as well as problems of bilateral relations with Venezuelan President Carlos Andres Perez. According to local observers, special attention will be devoted to energy problems, particularly, the problem of oil prices which is causing serious disagreement between the United States and OPEC, of which Venezuela is a member.

This foreign trip will also take the U.S. President to Brazil, Nigeria and Liberia.

End To Cuban Blockade Requested

LD282056Y Moscow TASS in English 1916 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Caracas, March 28, TASS--About 1,300 representatives of Venezuela's political, public and cultural circles demanded that Cuba's economic blockade by the United States be lifted. They did so in an open letter, addressed to U.S. President James Carter, who is due to arrive for an official visit in the country today.

Cuba's blockade, the letter stresses, is the result of the "cold war." It is at variance with the spirit of the time and should be lifted.

Nicaraguan Letter to Carter

LD290025Y Moscow TASS in English 2109 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Caracas, March 28, TASS--An open letter to President James Carter of the United States from a group of prominent Nicaraguans who oppose Somoza's dictatorial regime has been printed in the press of Venezuela where the American President is now paying an official visit.

In the course of more than four decades, the letter says, one of the most tyrannical regimes is ruling Nicaragua with the patronage of the United States. By pursuing a policy of giving utmost support to the dictator, the United States is acutally behaving like an enemy of the lawful interests of the Nicaraguan people. While President Carter speaks of "defence of human rights", the letter stresses, these rights are being most flagrantly violated in Nicaragua and the blood of the people is being shed. So the United States bears a considerable part of the responsibility for the dictatorship's terror and repressions.

The authors of the letter urge the U.S. Government to stop supporting Somoza, to respect the right of the people of Nicaragua (?to) freedom and self-determination.

ANTI-AMERICAN SENTIMENTS PERSIST IN LATIN AMERICA

LD281533Y Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Mar 78 Morning Edition p 4 LD

[Yevgeniy Bay commentary: "The Disagreements Are Intensifying"]

[Text] At the end of this month U.S. President J. Carter is planning to make a tour of a number of Latin American countries. A year ago the White House announced the "new approach" of the United States to that region. [paragraph continues]

That approach, which promised "understanding for the interests of each country and for the needs of the region as a whole", was to have reduced anti-American sentiments in Latin America. But this did not happen.

The United States is presenting the signing of the treaties of the new status of the Panama Canal as a gesture of "good will" toward its southern neighbors. The U.S. Senate recently approved, at last, the first of the two treaties--concerning the neutrality of the canal. However, this occurred only after amendments were made, which seriously encroach on Panama's sovereignty.

According to the New York TIMES, "Panamanian officials reacted angrily and sharply to the Senate's adoption of these amendments." "U.S. reactionary circles are seeking to frustrate the ratification and to preserve a colonial enclave on the territory of Panama," writes the Panamanian newspaper REPUBLICA. It notes that movement of thousands of U.S. paratroopers to the Canal Zone on the eve of the ratification of the treaties looks more like blackmailing of Panama than an attempt to establish "mutual understanding" with it.

Washington's aid to dictorial regimes also provokes resentment among the people of Latin America. At a time when Somoza's reactionary clique in Nicaragua had been rocked by blows inflicted by antigovernment actions, the United States hastened to offer it a $20 million credit. "Thanks only to U.S. support," the Peruvian newspaper OJO notes, "Somoza and the other tyrants of Latin America are perpetrating blood-curdling crimes and are trampling human rights."

The protests by the people of Latin America are also provoked by the United States' unceasing economic diktat. The U.S. decision to raise customs tariffs on imported sugar was greeted in Latin America by a storm of indignation. At the recent eighth conference of Latin American and Caribbean sugar exporting countries, it was noted that aggressive protectionism has become the basis of U.S. foreign trade policy. Under cover of statements about "understanding the needs of the region," the United States is plundering its "junior partners," and is strengthening its own limping economy at their expense.

"Deep mistrust" predominates in inter-American affairs, the Washington POST affirms. The main reason for this is the incompatibility of the U.S. monopolies' interests and the interests of the people of the Latin American countries.

SENATE 'SHACKLES' PANAMA CANAL TREATY WITH AMENDMENTS

LD281443Y Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Mar 78 p 5 LD

[Correspondent Ye. Rusakov dispatch: "'Yes' With Reservations"]

[Text] New York, 22 March--By a vote of 68 to 32 the U.S. Senate has ratified the treaty providing for the maintenance of the Panama Canal's "eternal neutrality" after it is handed over to Panama 31 December 1999. The ratification will be followed by discussion of the second treaty--on the actual transfer of the Panama Canal before the year 2000. The vote is expected at the beginning of April.

The Senate has included two shackling amendments to the neutrality treaty, which guarantee the United States' right to armed interference in the Canal Zone even after the Canal has been turned over to Panama and priority passage for U.S. warships over ships of other countries in the event of an emergency.

Before the vote on the ratification of the neutrality treaty, the Senate approved a further "reservation" for the document, giving the United States additional pretexts for armed interference after the transfer of the canal. Senator D. DeConcini, author of the "reservation," included in these pretexts strikes and other "internal disorders" in the Canal Zone, as well as an "external threat."

UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE LEAVES FOR TURKEY, UK, FRG

LD282234Y Moscow TASS in English 2229 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Washington, March 28, TASS--Under Secretary of State of the United States Warren Christopher has left on a foreign tour during which he will visit Turkey, the FRG and Britain. It follows from a State Department statement that "questions of the North Atlantic alliance" will be the main theme of the talks conducted by Washington's envoy in the capitals of all the three countries. In Ankara, Warren Christopher will discuss the Cyprus problem and bilateral relations with Turkey.

Commenting on Christopher's mission, political observers note that it is being undertaken within the framework of American attempts to impede Turkey's departure from NATO and pursuance by the Turkish Government of a more independent foreign policy. The United States was particularly displeased by a recent statement by the Turkish Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit, who stressed that his country's membership in NATO cannot ensure security for the Turkish people.

PROPAGANDA CANNOT HIDE U.S. 'COMPLICITY' WITH ISRAEL

LD281427Y Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Mar 78 p 5 LD

[Correspondent T. Kolesnichenko dispatch under general headline "Complicity with the Aggressor"]

[Text] New York, 24 March--President Carter's talks with Israeli Prime Minister Begin have ended in Washington. The reports on the results of this meeting note the "serious differences" between the United States and Israel. However, this refers not to Tel Aviv's aggression against Lebanon, not to the cardinal questions of a Near East settlement, but merely...to the Israeli settlements in Sinai, which were the stumbling block in the separate talks between As-Sadat and Begin. In short, it was as though the echo of the bombardments in southern Lebanon has not reached Washington.

One would think that it would be precisely now, when Israel has again perpetrated aggression against the Arab people, that one might expect this state's prime minister to be sharply snubbed in Washington. It is no secret that the United States has sufficient potential to curb the "hotheads" of Tel Aviv, who have overstepped the mark, and sufficient means to make Israel immediately end its occupation of southern Lebanon and fulfill the UN resolution on the withdrawal of troops from all occupied Arab territories. But there was no talk of this kind in the White House.

Is this not why Begin is behaving so defiantly? As the New York TIMES writes, he "displayed firmness and did not give way on a single issue." The withdrawal of troops from Lebanon? "Israel's government has not yet reached a final decision." Fulfilling Security Council resolution no 242? "Israel has no intention of withdrawing its troops from all the territories occupied by Israel." The Israeli settlements? "Mr Begin," the same New York TIMES writes, "made it clear that the construction of these settlements on the West Bank of the Jordan will continue." The only thing on which Begin maybe "gave way" is that he promised to halt the creation of new settlements in the Sinai Peninsula and to return part of it to Egypt.

Thus the results of the talks have again essentially revealed Washington's complicity with Israel--complicity which is taking place against the background of worldwide condemnation of Tel Aviv's aggressive policy. This essence of the U.S. position and policy in the Near East cannot be camouflaged by any hypocritical propaganda.

NEGOTIATIONS CONTINUE WITH ALLIES ON NEUTRON BOMB

LD282110Y Moscow TASS in English 2030 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

["'Privilege' of Western Europe"--TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, March 28, TASS--The U.S. State Department has denied American press reports, which said that the United States interrupted the negotiations with its NATO allies on the question of neutron weapon deployment in Western Europe. An official spokesman of the State Department has said that consultations are continuing with the NATO allies pertaining to the weapon of increased radiation.

The U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, in an interview to the West German DER SPIEGEL has reaffirmed that the United States is now negotiating with its NATO allies the question of neutron weapon deployment. The secretary of state said that the only theatre of operations where the neutron bomb could possibly be used is Europe.

AMERICA ASKED TO 'BURY' PLANS FOR NEUTRON BOMB

LD211948Y Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 21 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Moscow, March 21 TASS--The militarist circles of the United States try to intimidate the Soviet people with the neutron bomb and also to ensure through "neutron" blackmail "stronger" positions in various inter-state talks, Vadim Kozhevnikov writes in IZVESTIYA.

"We were not intimidated with horrible atrocities of German fascism during World War Two, by its threats with 'super weapon', the precursor to the atomic bomb, in the days when we were storming the very den of fascism", the prominent Soviet author writes. "We were not intimidated either with disastrous atomic explosions in which the population of Nagasaki and Hiroshima perished. These atomic explosions staged by the United States were also meant to play the role of diplomatic 'arguments' of Washington to its ally in the anti-fascist coalition. What was the reaction of our people to these nuclear diplomatic arguments? Was it fear? No. It was wrath and condemnation. And we had to provide material evidence that atomic weapons were no longer the United States monopoly at all.

"We made the atom to serve peace. We do not threaten anyone with it. We develop the industrial might of our country for the benefit of the people and its peaceful creative goals, and we do not want the atom to serve any other purposes. We reject it as a weapon of annihilation of humans and we condemn with indignation those who try to speculate on the nuclear threat, who count on it as a means of violence over the very nature of human soul and life."

"No to the neutron bomb", the voice of protest of the working people, with whom police battle in all United States' cities, sounds ever louder. No to the neutron bomb, says the voice of entire progressive mankind.

Would it not be wiser to bury the plans of the production of the neutron bomb, the latest weapon of mass destruction of humans meant for purposes of plundering and pillage, to bury them, doing justice to allpeople of goodwill on earth who firmly said "no" to the neutron bomb out of concern for peaceful future of nations.

The Soviet people believe in this decision. We extend our hand to America with friendship, we have no wish to clench it into a fist. We believe in the power of wisdom and we are unshakeable in this. We go along a difficult road to universal peace on earth and, together with all people of goodwill, spare no efforts to remove all the blocks from the road of peace, justice and prosperity of entire mankind.

PENTAGON'S INDIAN OCEAN DESIGNS THREATEN PEACE, SECURITY

LD2914317 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Mar 78 p 5 LD

[Vladilen Baykov dispatch: "The Ocean and the Pentagon"]

[Text] Islamabad--According to press reports, a new U.S. naval task force composed of one missile-carrying cruiser, two frigates and one auxiliary vessel, has entered the Indian Ocean. Construction is in full swing on the island of Diego Garcia, where the Pentagon is constructing naval and air bases, capable of servicing nuclear-powered submarines and strategic bombers. The purpose of the construction is to strengthen the extensive network of U.S. strongpoints and bases which gird the entire perimeter of the Indian Ocean from the shores of Australia to South Africa.

Washington's desire to strengthen and extend its military presence in the Indian Ocean has been conditioned by a number of factors. U.S. monopolies covet the rich natural resources of the countries situated there. More than half the known oil reserves in the nonsocialist world are concentrated in that region, as are most of the world's production of rubber, tea and tin ore. The Pentagon would like to control an important strategic region through which pass trade routes linking Europe with Asia, Japan and Australia.

The U.S. ruling circles try to conceal their far-reaching plans behind farfetched arguments about the need to "counter the Soviet danger." But the public in Asian countries is well aware that the Soviet Union consistently advocates limiting military activities in the Indian Ocean and turning it into a zone of peace. This is stated, in particular, in the Soviet memorandum submitted at the UN General Assembly session in 1976.

The Pentagon's design in many Asian countries are correctly regarded as a direct threat to peace and security in this region. The creation of U.S. military bases, the journal FAR EASTERN ECONOMIC REVIEW writes, represents a continuation of the policy of the United States as world policeman. The U.S. actions, the Indian newspaper PATRIOT points out, signify "interference in the affairs of Asian countries." Reflecting the opinion of broad circles of the Pakistani public, the newspaper AWAMI JUMHURIYAT points out that the new U.S. preparations are undoubtedly creating a threat to the freedom and security of the young states of Asia and Africa.

The buildup of U.S. military preparations in the Indian Ocean runs counter to the desire of the Asian people for peace, cooperation and independent national development. They demand an end to the Pentagon's intrigues.

PEOPLE'S DAILY COMMENT, DISCORD AMONG PRC LEADERS SCORED

OW280936Y Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 27 Mar 78 OW

[Mulatov commentary]

[Excerpts] Judging from the PRC Foreign Ministry note to the Soviet Embassy in Peking and the PEOPLE'S DAILY 26 March commentary, the Chinese leaders want to perpetuate the artificial tensions in Soviet-Chinese relations and the anti-Soviet sentiments in China. They are completely ignoring the possibility of joint action by the Soviet Union and China to normalize bilateral relations. It is noteworthy that the Chinese side rejected the proposal to hold a summit to formulate and adopt a joint statement on the principles of mutual relations between the Soviet Union and China. This constructive proposal was contained in the message from the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to the PRC National People's Congress [NPC] Standing Committee.

In view of the Chinese side's negative attitude, I wish to call your attention to the fact that in any report, speech or interview with the press given by any of the high-ranking Chinese leaders, they inevitably refer to--in different ways--the "Soviet threat to China"--a shameless and provocative cliche. What does it mean? Does a "threat" really exist? Of course not. The use of the cliche reveals a completely different situation, that is, the Chinese leaders do not want to eliminate the anti-Soviet poison and the deceitful fallacies from political life in China.

I wish to remind you that this fallacy was concocted and widely publicized during the first Cultural Revolution when Lin Piao, Mao Tse-tung and the "gang of four" conducted sinister activities in China. People throughout the world have long realized that the "Soviet threat" myth, which was discussed in the PEOPLE's DAILY 26 March commentary, was presented by the Chinese leaders to defend their domestic policies. The "Soviet threat" theme that has been sensationalized for over a decade is aimed at distracting the Chinese people's attention from the continuous setbacks of Mao Tse-tung's domestic policy. The Chinese leaders need the myth to justify their policy of war preparedness. We must pay close attention to all of this in correctly appraising the real motive of the Chinese side's rejection of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's message to the PRC NPC Standing Committee.

Many facts show that the Chinese leaders basically do not want to eliminate the fraudulent "Soviet threat" issue from their agenda. In 1971 the Chinese deemed unacceptable the Soviet proposal to conclude a treaty on the nonuse of force. In 1973 the Chinese again rejected the Soviet proposal for signing a nonaggression treaty. After Mao Tse-tung's death, the Chinese deliberately ignored the Soviet Union's unilateral efforts to end public criticism of China. Now the Chinese authorities react negatively to the constructive proposal by the Soviet Union for formulating a joint statement on bilateral relations based on the principles of peaceful coexistence. All this indicates that the Chinese leaders are determined to ignore or discard any proposal which may be or should be conducive to improvement in our relations or which will promote a constructive atmosphere between us. In giving our correct appraisal of the Chinese leaders' attitude, we maintain that the policy conducted in accordance with the doctrines of Lin Piao, Mao Tse-tung and the "gang of four" is a short-sighted approach to Soviet-Chinese relations.

Let us discuss Hua Kuo-feng's speech at the National Science Conference. In the opinion of some foreign observers, the speech eloquently shows his dissatisfaction with Teng Hsiao-ping's speech at the opening session of the conference and with his leadership during such an important meeting. Attention is directed to the fact that, unlike Teng Hsiao-ping, Hua Kuo-feng emphasized that the work of any of the four modernizations should be performed under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Moreover, Hua Kuo-feng was apparently criticizing Teng Hsiao-ping when he pointed out that "raising the scientific and cultural level of the people is not solely a matter of imparting knowledge but is a great class struggle." All of this indicates that, regrettably, the relationship between China's two principal leaders is far from harmonious. The conciliation reached among the various factions within the Chinese leadership during the preparations for the NPC is shaky and a matter of expediency.

PRC SCIENCE CONFERENCE, STATUS OF SCIENTISTS EXAMINED

OW281136Y Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 1430 GMT 27 Mar 78 OW

[Churin commentary]

[Excerpts] There is a Chinese folk saying: As a man sows, so does he reap. When I read Teng Hsiao-ping's speech at the National Science Conference, I must think of this saying, which exactly portrays the present lamentable state of scientific work in China.

According to Teng Hsiao-ping, scientific work in China was devastated and intellectuals were persecuted for a long time. As a result, China's national economy is on the brink of disaster and there is an increasing gap between the level of China's science and advanced world levels. "Our scientific and technical forces," he said, "are still very weak and are far from meeting the needs of modernization." This is solely a result of the "gang of four's" activities, he added.

Of course, nothing is right with the "gang of four." However, I think there is a much deeper reason for the crisis in China's science and technology. The crisis actually originated with Mao Tse-tung's antisocialist and voluntarist policy.

Twenty years ago, when the "gang of four" had not yet ascended the political ladder in China, Mao Tse-tung launched the adventurist Great Leap Forward movement. The principle characteristic of this movement was that it started with a purge. It was in this movement that Mao Tse-tung's "red and expert" policy evolved. This policy resulted in the criminal political persecution of intellectuals. Many renowned scholars were mistreated and forced to abandon their work. Propaganda organs made incessant efforts to publicize their "backwardness," hinting that their knowledge and rich experience in scientific work was "absolutely unnecessary" in China.

During the Great Cultural Revolution, science was treated no better than during the Great Leap Forward period. At that time, scientific research facilities were closed. Scientists representing China's glory and prospects were sent to the countryside and smeared and ridiculed by the ignorant Red Guards under the direction of Mao Tse-tung and the "gang of four." A policy to practically eliminate intellectuals, who are part of the basic social stratum, was conducted. Almost all intellectuals were regarded as "specialists without a socialist conscience" who could not be trusted politically. The savage Dark Ages reappeared throughout China. The creators of this terrifying hell on the earth were none other than Mao Tse-tung and his vassals, the "gang of four."

Today, Teng Hsiao-ping requests the development of science and urges scientists to spend at least five-sixths of their work hours in academic research. However, it should not be forgotten that the political wind in China may change direction drastically from time to time. Striking proof of this is Teng Hsiao-ping's own political career. The drastic changes of the political wind have invariably reflected the ceaseless power struggle in Peking's high ruling clique fostered and supported by Mao Tse-tung. Western observers claim that the power struggle in Chungnanhai continues. Following the recent National People's Congress, the struggle appears to be more acute than ever. A split exists between the Teng Hsiao-ping group and the proponents of the Great Cultural Revolution. At the National People's Congress, Teng Hsiao-ping was not selected as premier of the State Council, and Hua Kuo-feng continued as premier. As was emphasized by Western observers, Hua Kuo-feng was Mao Tse-tung's puppet and was promoted during the Great Cultural Revolution. He has twice persecuted Teng Hsiao-ping. Currently in China everyone is talking about the necessity to develop science and technology as well as the economy and to make this a task of prime importance. However, who knows how this will be dealt with tomorrow?

TENG MASTERMINDS PINCER ATTACK AGAINST SOVIET UNION

LD251412Y Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English to Asia 1130 GMT 25 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Peking is ready to side with the imperialists, specifically the American imperialists, in pursuing an anti-Soviet and antisocialist policy. This was the gist of the talk between Vice Premier Teng Hsiao-ping and the West German revanchist, Friedrich Zimmerman, visiting in China. Teng reiterated the concept of inevitability of a new world war and outlined a scheme of an anti-Soviet alliance. By his scheme China and Japan must threaten the Soviet Union from the east, and the United States and its Western allies from the west. Observers consider the scheme as Peking's invitation to Western states to take part in a crusade against world socialism.

PRC MINISTER'S RADIO ADDRESS CLAIMS THREAT TO SCANDANAVIA

LD281412Y Moscow TASS in English 1356 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

["Echoing the Same Tune"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, March 28, TASS--TASS commentator Vladimir Chernyshov writes: On the occasion of the visit by Knut Frydenlund, Norwegian minister of foreign affairs, to the PRC, his Chinese counterpart Huang Hua was given an opportunity to speak over Norwegian radio recently. What did the head of the Chinese diplomatic service deem it necessary to tell his radio audiences? Well, of course, he said that the USSR threatens the security of Scandinavian countries and that the policy detente is only 'a manoeuvre of Moscow' which he said intends to subordinate West European countries and then establish world dominance.

There is no need to prove the falsity of the Chinese minister's calumnies. It is known to all that the Soviet Union has no territorial or any other claims to anyone. The principles of peaceful coexistence are sealed in the fundamental law of the USSR. The Soviet country strives for the consistent implementation of the final act of the European conference's final act which proclaims the inviolability of the existing borders, and struggles for disarmament and detente. What did Huang Hua need the gross anti-Soviet lies for? Judging from everything, it was reported to him that many Norwegians now express quite serious doubts as to the expediency of their country's further participation in NATO. So, the Chinese minister hurried to the aid of his fellow thinkers in the aggressive alliance which is spearheaded against the Soviet Union. Only their arguments hardly became more convincing as a result of that.

SFRY'S MINIC ARRIVES IN MOSCOW FOR TALKS; MET BY GROMYKO

LD2718O4Y Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 27 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Minic, member of the Presidium of the LCY Executive Committee, deputy chairman of the Federal Executive Council and federal secretary of foreign affairs of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, arrived in Moscow today on a short working visit.

He was met at the airport by Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs; Rusakov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials.

The welcoming party included Smole, Yugoslav ambassador to the Soviet Union.

Gromyko, Minic Discuss Issues

LD281328Y Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1312 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Moscow--Talks took place today between Andrey Gromyko, member of CPSU Central Committee Politburo and minister of foreign affairs, and Milos Minic, member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, vice president of the Federal Executive Council and federal secretary for foreign affairs of the SFRY.

During the conversation, which took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere, disarmament and preparations for the special session of the UN General Assembly, the situation in the Near East and other international questions were discussed. An exchange of views took place on the strengthening of security and cooperation in Europe and in this context the results of the Belgrade meeting were positively appraised.

Andrey Gromyko gave a luncheon for Milos Minic the same day.

[Belgrade TANJUG in English at 1902 GMT on 28 March adds the following to the above item: "Ministers Minic and Gromyko had a wide range of views on the situation in the Horn of Africa and in the Middle East. At the talks Milos Minic informed Gromyko on the activities of the nonaligned countries in preparation of the minister's activities of the nonaligned movement and to problems which arise in it, pointing especially to the attempts to divide the nonaligned countries on various foundations. Soviet Minister Gromyko pointed out that the Soviet Union views the nonaligned movement as an important factor in international relations."]

Received by Brezhnev

LD281142Y Moscow TASS in English 1139 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Moscow, March 28, TASS--Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received in the Kremlin today Milos Minic, member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, vice president of the Federal Executive Council, and federal secretary for foreign affairs of the SFRY, who handed L. Brezhnev a message from Broz Tito, the president of the SFRY and chairman of the LCY.

During the talk on which Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, took part, the two sides noted with satisfaction the confident growth of Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation in many fields. They expressed confidence that as a result of mutual efforts, relations between the CPSU and the LCY, between the USSR and the SFRY will be further developed in the years to come.

They also touched upon a number of international issues of interest to both sides. They stressed the need for vigorous action to deepen the relaxation of international tension, to stop the arms race and to achieve disarmament, to maintain even good-neighbour [as received] relations between states and further assert the policy of peaceful coexistence.

[Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1130 GMT on 28 March repeats the above item and adds the following: "The conversation passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere. Blatov, aide to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Smole, SFRY ambassador to the USSR, were present during the conversation." The last two lines of the above item are rendered in the Russian version as follows: to maintain equal goodneighborly relations among states.]

Minic Presents Tito Message

LD282152Y Belgrade TANJUG in English 1637 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Moscow, March 28, (TANJUG)--Yugoslav Vice-Premier and Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs Milos Minic today presented a message from President Tito to Communist Party of the Soviet Union General-Secretary and Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. Presidium Chairman Leonid Brezhnev. Leonid Brezhnev received Minic in the Kremlin and spent almost two hours and a half with him.

During their examination of topical international questions, the indispensability was underlined of active efforts toward easing international tensions, halting the armament race, attaining disarmament, maintaining stable and good-neighborly relations among states and further consolidating the policy of peaceful coexistence.

Brezhnev and Minic with satisfaction pointed to the favorable development of Yugoslav-Soviet cooperation in various areas. In so doing, they expressed their firm conviction that, with joint efforts, relations between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will successfully develop in the future, too.

Brezhnev Positively Assesses Message

LD282154Y Belgrade TANJUG in English 1826 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Moscow, March 28 (TANJUG)--Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party and president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., has highly assessed a message from Yugoslav President Tito, it has been learned. The message was presented to Brezhnev in the Kremlin today by Yugoslav Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs Milos Minic. On this occasion, Brezhnev and Minic conducted talks on a large number of questions related to Yugoslav-Soviet relations and on certain current international problems.

Emphasizing the importance of President Tito's message, Leonid Brezhnev assessed as positive the practice of an intensive exchange of views between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union on all questions of interest to mutual relations and the resolution of different international problems. In Brezhnev's assessment, this exchange is characterized by a high degree of cooperation and mutual appreciation of views.

Life shows, said Brezhnev, that such an exchange of views is completely justified and that it contributes better understanding and cooperation in resolving international problems. In the course of a long talk, Brezhnev and Minic devoted the greatest attention to the relaxation of international tensions. Note was made of the need for intensified efforts to overcome difficulties which have arisen lately in the process of detente and in ending the arms race. Brezhnev and Minic also exchanged opinions in the situation in the Horn of Africa and in the Middle East. Especially discussed were the two countries' preparations for the forthcoming U.N. General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament.

Report on Talks

LD282222Y Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1735 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Excerpt] According to the mutual assessment, the talks in the Kremlin were very meaningful and specific and took place in a warm and cordial atmosphere. Andrey Gromyko, minister of foreign affairs, and Joze Smole, the Yugoslav ambassador in the Soviet Union, took part in the talks. The talks in the Kremlin showed that Yugoslav-Soviet relations are developing favorably in all spheres. Leonid Brezhnev expressed satisfaction with the development of these relations and in this context pointed out the significance of the forthcoming visit to Yugoslavia by Petr Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Soviet minister of culture.

After the luncheon given in honor of the Yugoslav guest at Spiridonovka, the Soviet Government villa, Milos Minic and Andrey Gromyko held talks on the most important international problems. These talks were also attended by Viktor Maltsev and Nikolay Rodionov, first deputy minister and deputy minister of foreign affairs, respectively, and on the Yugoslav side, by Joze Smole, the Yugoslav ambassador; Milan Veres, assistant federal secretary for foreign affairs; Rajko Kmezevic, head of administration at the Federal Secretariat for Foreign Affairs; Ilija Djukic, minister counselor of the Yugoslav Embassy in Moscow; and others.

Deputy premier Minic presented the Yugoslav views on the development of the situation in the Horn of Africa following his visit to Addis Ababa, Mogadiscio and Khartoum. In the talks, the need to contribute to the resolution of the Ethiopian and Somali conflict by political means was mutually noted. Taken as a whole, there was an identity of views regarding a lasting solution to this crisis. In the talks referring to the Middle East problems, both sides stressed the significance of achieving Arab unity and they emphasized that in the event of further violation of this unity, the situation in that part of the world will worsen.

At the end of the talks, Andrey Gromyko and Milos Minic told journalists that they were very satisfied with the exchange of views they had. They particularly stressed the fact that a very large number of topical international problems had been discussed in the talks.

Departs USSR For Home

LD291338Y Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT 29 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Moscow, March 29, TASS--Milos Minic, member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, vice chairman of the Federal Executive Council, federal secretary for foreign affairs of Yugoslavia, left Moscow for home today after paying a brief business visit.

Milos Minic was received by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Leonid Brezhnev. Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR Andrey Gromyko had a conversation with Milos Minic. Andrey Gromyko gave a luncheon in honour of his Yugoslav colleague.

USSR GENERAL YEPISHEV WELCOMES CSSR COUNTERPART

LD272225Y Prague Domestic Service in Czech and Slovak 2100 GMT 27 Mar 78 LD

[Text] A delegation of the Main Political Directorate of the Czechoslovak People's Army, led by its chief, Lt Gen Antonin Brabec, arrived in Moscow today on an official visit. The Czechoslovak guests were greeted at the airport by Army Gen Aleksey Yepishev, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy. Shortly after its arrival the Czechoslovak delegation began talks with its Soviet partners and visited an exhibition on the 60th anniversary of the Soviet Army.

Ustinov Receives Delegation

LD281212Y Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1130 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Marshal Dmitriy Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and minister of national defense, received in Moscow today a delegation of the Main Political Directorate of the Czechoslovak People's Army headed by Lt Gen Antonin Brabec, its chief. In the course of friendly discussion both sides informed each other about the fulfillment of tasks in the combat and political training of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

CEMA FOREIGN TRADE SESSION OPENS IN SOFIA

LD282018Y Moscow TASS in English 1914 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Sofia, March 28, TASS--A meeting of the CEMA Permanent Commission on Foreign Trade opened here today. It is attended by delegations of all CMEA-member countries and the CMEA Secretariat, and also delegations of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Korean Democratic People's Republic, as observers.

Nikolay Patolichev, chairman of the commission, foreign trade minister of the USSR, opened the meeting.

The participants in the meeting will discuss the commission's work last year, will outline measures of expanding and perfecting foreign trade exchange.

RED BRIGADES, SECRET SERVICES LINKED IN ITALIAN KIDNAPING

LD290008Y Moscow in Italian to Italy 1730 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Nikolay Tratsianov commentary: "A Wave of Terrorism in Italy"]

[Text] Not even the Easter holidays have reduced the tension created in Italy by the problem of increasing political terrorism.

As before, the search for Aldo Moro, president of the National Council of the Christian Democrats, kidnaped on 16 March by a group of terrorists, has remained the center of the country's attention. After the wounding of former Mayor of Turin Giovanni Picco, also a Christian Democrat, the situation has become even more tense. In both cases, the responsibility of the crimes has been claimed by the ultraleft Red Brigades which are masquerading behind the slogans of the so-called revolutionary proletarians. The Italian political circles, however, are becoming increasingly convinced that because of the character, detailed elaboration and financial capabilities of the terrorist actions it is likely that international reaction is involved in them. In Italy, the French paper L'HUMANITE writes, neither the Communists nor the Christian Democrats, nor the Socialists, have any doubts about the interference and role of foreign secret services, without which it would be difficult to plan and to carry out such an operation as the kidnaping of Aldo Moro. For its part, L'UNITA also states that the kidnapers' actions are very similar to special services' actions.

In this connection, the events which took place in Bologna a year ago are being recalled in Italy. At that time, groups of armed provocators staged disorders among the students. They too used an ultrarevolutionary phraseology. However, as it transpired, it was the American CIA which acted behind their backs. Denunciations were made from American sources close to the national students association in Washington. It was the CIA which prepared the "black coup" in Bologna after sending beforehand its agents to this university under the disguise of students. The aim of this unsuccessful action was to compromise the administration of a town of 500,000 inhabitants which had been managed by communists and socialists throughout the postwar period.

One must not forget that the present wave of violence culminated when an agreement was reached in Italy between five political parties on a qualitatively new solution to the government crisis. For the first time in 30 years, the Communists entered the parliamentary majority and obtained the possibility of contributing to the solution of economic and social problems on the basis of a common government program. This clarifies the aim of the latest actions by the extremists: to compel the Christian Democrats, one of the main political forces in the country, to renounce cooperation with the Communists. It is also obvious that the strategy of violence, carried out by all the types of extremists in Italy, is pursuing the aim of further intensifying an atmosphere of uncertainty, fear and tension, of intimidating the politically immature strata of the population and of shifting the political axis of the state to the right.

The reactionaries' plans, Enrico Berlinguer, secretary general of the Italian Communist Party said, are designed to hit the entire Italian democracy, to deprive the representative institutions of their meaning and prepare the ground for new dictatorships. For this reason, at this moment, the main task is to create a complete vacuum around subversive forces. Judging by the reaction in Italy to the terrorist actions, this is well understood by wide strata of the population. These days, they are showing inflexible determination to defend the republican democratic regime from any attack, regardless of from where it comes.

MORO KIDNAPING AIMED TO CAUSE 'TENSION AND FEAR'

LD2814O1Y Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Mar 78 p 5 LD

[Correspondent N. Prozhogin dispatch: "The Intrigues Continue"]

[Text] Rome, 23 March--Italy is still living under the effect of an act of terrorism--the kidnaping of A. Moro, prominent politician and chairman of the National Council of the Christian Democratic Party, and the murder of five members of his bodyguard. Apart from police and carabinieri, military units have also been brought in for the search. Together with Italian specialists, groups of foreign antiterrorist experts, invited from the FRG and Britain, are at work. The Italian Government has issued a decree giving the police new powers and increasing the penalties for terrorist activity.

However, the search for the terrorists has not so far led to any substantial results. A few suspects have been arrested, statements by witnesses have been collected, and photographs of persons suspected of complicity with the criminals have been distributed.

The intentions of those who inspired this criminal act are gradually being revealed--to create an atmosphere of tension and fear in Italy, to sow doubt in the ability of the constitutional forces to insure order, and to undermine people's confidence in the communists and other leftwing democratic forces of the country.

The care with which the act committed by the criminals was prepared and the professionalism with which they managed to cover their tracks confirm the widespread opinion here that this was a large-scale operation in which special services outside Italy, operating in the interests of those circles which have set themselves the goal of shaking the republican system, are evidently involved. Unfortunately, this time too, despite the tragic nature of the situation it has been impossible to escape from those who are fond of "fishing in troubled waters."

The new political crime which is directed, like many committed in recent years in Italy, at whipping up tension in the life of the country, cannot but play into the hands of the forces of domestic and international reaction. The broad strata of Italy's population have realized this very well and have come out into the streets and city squares in order to say "no" to terrorism and to demonstrate their adamant determination to defend the republican system and to insure the development and strengthening of their democratic gains.

PCF PLEA OF 'UNJUST' FRENCH ELECTION SYSTEM CITED

ID281423Y Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 78 Morning Edition p 3 ID

[L. Volodin report: "After the Elections"]

[Text] Paris--In France the election posters depicting the candidates are being covered over by advertisements for concerts--the parliamentary elections are now past. Everyone already knows the results--291 seats for the coalition of parties of the ruling majority, and 200 for the leftwing opposition. The time has come to consider and assess the election results.

The assessments differ, and this is perfectly understandable. The rightwing camp, rejoicing in its success, is seeking to ascribe it to the French people's "common sense" and their refusal to accept the Joint Program of the leftwing forces. More objective commentators give different reasons which considerably influenced the distribution of seats in the second round of the elections. For instance, the newspaper LE MATIN believes that the record turnout of voters in the second round (about 85 percent) favored the rightwing forces: additional supporters of theirs, who had abstained in the first round, went to the polls. The bourgeoisie has announced "the universal mobilization of its ranks," as the newspaper put it, to bar the way to the leftwing forces' Joint Program spearheaded against its class interests and privileges. The Paris stock exchange's reaction to this "zeal" displayed by its clients in the second round is not surprising: The following day the shares of the majority of French enterprises rose over 5 percent, and some by as much as 20 percent.

But the unjust configuration of the electoral districts which, under the simple majority electoral system, favors the rightwing parties, played a far greater part, the Paris press notes.

This was also borne out by the second round. In it the leftwing parties collected a total of 49.29 percent of the votes, while the parties of the government coalition collected 50.49 percent. In absolute figures in the second round the parties of the ruling majority obtained only 311,360 more votes from the 26,206,000 members of the electorate who voted. But the difference between these main political groupings in terms of the number of seats they obtained is quite considerable--91 in favor of the rightwing parties. "The ruling coalition," a French Communist Party Politburo statement says, "retains its advantage in terms of the number of seats only thanks to the extremely unjust electoral law."

Although the government majority has remained virtually the same as a result of the parliamentary elections, commentators emphasize that the new government will be obliged to take into account the will and opinions of the almost 50 percent of the electorate which voted for the candidates of the leftwing forces. Paris political circles are suggesting that in his new government course the president will take into account the results of the elections and offer certain socioeconomic measures which could promote the solution of the problems facing France.

The new National Assembly will hold its first session on 2 April.

SOVIET POLICY TOWARD WEST BERLIN EXPOUNDED

LD281258Y Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in German to Germany 1900 GMT 26 Mar 78 LD

[Text] We have received a letter from Irmgard Busch, Kirchheim, FRG, who asks about Soviet policy on West Berlin. This topic has frequently been discussed in our program. There have, unfortunately, been plenty of occasions to discuss it. After the conclusion of the quadripartite agreement, the situation concerning West Berlin has improved, but not to the extent of regarding it as completely normal. There are forces that seek to create complications concerning West Berlin. They see this as the whole point of the city's existence and justification for the billions of marks spent by the FRG on subsidising it.

West Berlin came into being in 1948 but not by Soviet volition. The West artificially created it. The separation of one part of Berlin from its surrounding territory, setting up a separate parliament and government and having industry which must look to markets hundreds of miles away are unnatural. These unnatural and preposterous things were done deliberately.

The founding fathers of West Berlin were not interested in how the city would exist. They were hoping to use it to open the gate to the East within a few years. The gate did not open. But West Berlin has remained to this day a singular monument in central Europe to the adventurism and political irresponsibility of those who believed that they could push socialism out of Europe.

This outpost of the Western world in the heart of the Socialist German Democratic Republic is being maintained at the Federal Republic's expense. It is being guarded by the troops of the three Western powers, and NATO doctors are keeping it alive. Why?

First, what can the West in general and the FRG in particular do now? To renounce West Berlin would to be admit that its creation was futile. Second, certain people in the West are still hoping to exploit the city to implement their aggressive plans against the GDR and to undermine detente. The socialist countries have no claim on West Berlin. They are prepared to assist in satisfying the legitimate interests and requirements of the city and its population. The Soviet Union and the GDR agreed to the conclusion of the quadripartite agreement. Hardly anyone would dare (?deny) its importance for the (?city's) life. The present system for transit traffic on the communication routes of the GDR, the facilities for West Berliners to visit the GDR and many other things clearly show the socialist countries' good will, their desire to close the West Berlin question and not to return to it. The socialist countries sincerely want West Berlin to become a (?normal and peaceful) European city. [sentence indistinct]

Why does it disturb the development of relations between the Soviet Union and the FRG and normal cooperation in the international arena? The brief answer is that the causes lie in the FRG's policy. West Berlin is not and will not be a constituent part of the FRG. It is not a place in which the FRG and the West in general can organize risky political experiments or provocative demonstrations against the socialist countries.

West German politicians, however, assume that they can keep pursuing the line of reinforcing the so-called federal presence in West Berlin and treat the city like an FRG federal state. It is a line of undermining the status quo, of creating complications or conflicts. It does not matter by what arguments this line is explained and what level niceties are invoked. [passage indistinct]

After the conclusion of the quadripartite agreement, the Soviet Union and the GDR repeatedly suggested an end to the disputes over West Berlin, that the FRG stop testing the strength of the agreement and haggling over the interpretation of every word and comma in this document. Attempts to put pressure on the socialist countries and to frighten them by saying that in the absence of concessions over West Berlin, the FRG would not cooperate with them are futile. That is not the language of a mutually acceptable approach to this issue. Anyone who resorts to such methods risks a fall. The Soviet Union and the GDR do not trade policies. All points on which they were able to accommodate the FRG and West Berlin have been reflected in the quadripartite agreement. By way of response, the West made the required concessions. This created a balance of interests and made it possible to conclude the agreement.

Soviet policy on West Berlin is constructive. It is based on the demand for the strict observance and full application of the quadripartite agreement. The Soviet Union is not seeking any onesided advantage. But it will not abandon its interests and those of its allies. It is in the interest of all sides to do everything to insure that West Berlin is not a stumbling block on the path of developing European cooperation. All sides must make a contribution of equal value toward this end.

SAUDI KING REPORTEDLY CABLES CARTER ON DOLLAR

LD281710Y Moscow TASS in English 1632 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] London, March 28 TASS--The DAILY TELEGRAPH newspaper reports that King Khalid of Saudi Arabia sent a message to President Carter of the USA expressing concern over continued fall of the dollar which is the main settlement unit in fixing prices for the Middle East oil. The Saudi monarch warned that if the American currency continued to devalue the Saudi Arabia would no longer be able to keep the members of the petroleum-exporting countries organization from raising oil prices.

BEGIN SUGGESTS RESUMPTION OF TALKS WITH EGYPT

LD282100Y Moscow TASS in English 1935 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Beirut, March 28 TASS--Israeli radio has reported that Israel's Prime Minister Begin today sent a message to Egyptian President as-Sadat, suggesting resumption of the interrupted political and military negotiations between the two countries. To bring nearer the day of resumption of the negotiations, the Israeli Defence Minister Weizman is to visit Cairo in the near future. The radio points out that Begin's proposal was made in reply to As-Sadat's message received earlier.

CONTINUING MATERIAL ON ISRAELI MOVE INTO LEBANON

Israeli Troop Concentration

LD281800Y Moscow TASS in English 1657 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

["The Aggressor Is Building Up Tension"--TASS headline]

[Text] Beirut, March 28 TASS--There have been signs in recent days of the further aggravation of the situation in south Lebanon. Defying the U.N. Security Council's decision on an immediate withdrawal of troops from the occupied Lebanese territory, Israel seems to be preparing a new armed provocation in the area. The Israeli command continues rushing more troop contingents and arms to south Lebanon. Eyewitnesses report the concentration of Israeli tank and mechanized units. It is believed that the Israeli military is preparing to cross the Litani River in the eastern sector.

Israeli artillery keeps under heavy fire the positions of the units of the Palestine resistance movement and the Lebanese national patriotic forces in the areas of Hasbani, Abu-Kamha, Kawkaba. Last night, an Israeli mechanized unit tried to capture the Hasbaya bridge across the Litani River. This attempt was beaten back by the national patriotic forces and the Palestine resistance movement. One Israeli tank and several personnel carriers were damaged during the engagement.

Israel continues to give all-round support to the Lebanese conservative forces, supplying them generously with arms and military equipment. Relying on this support the commander of the armed formations of the conservative forces in the south of Lebanon, Haddad, said that the so-called "south Lebanese army" (which was established in violation of Lebanese laws--ed.) Is going in the long run to take the districts now occupied by Israeli troops fully under its control.

The main task of this army, he stressed, is to prevent the Palestine resistance movement and the Lebanese national patriotic forces from reestablishing their positions in the south of Lebanon. Observers regard the plan disclosed by Haddad as part of a general conspiracy which aims to establish in the south of Lebanon a separate state formation closely linked with Israel.

Political circles in Lebanon are especially concerned by yesterday's statement of Israeli Defence Minister Weizman who openly threatened to escalate Israel's aggression against Lebanon.

At the same time the Lebanese Government, the national patriotic forces and the Palestine resistance movement expressed willingness to do everything in their power to normalize the situation in the south of the country. The Beirut newspapers report that Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, at his yesterday meeting with Lebanese Prime Minister Salim al-Huss, reaffirmed the willingness of the Palestine resistance movement to facilitate in every way the discharge of the mission of the U.N. force in the south Lebanese districts and to obey all the demands of its command.

The leadership of the Progressive Socialist Party of Lebanon has also announced its determination to contribute in every way to the success of the U.N. peace-keeping force. At the same time it denounced attempts by the conservative "Lebanese front" to use Israel's aggression as a pretext for depriving the Palestine resistance movement of rights it has enjoyed in Lebanon under an agreement with the lawful authorities of the country.

New York, March 28 TASS--Kurt Waldheim, U.N. secretary general, speaking of the situation in south Lebanon which was occupied as a result of the recent Israeli aggression, said that a number of incidents causing "serious concern" have taken place in the area.

According to reports from U.N. observers, Israeli artillery, contrary to the Security Council's demand for a ceasefire, has repeatedly opened fire in the course of the last twenty-four hours from the occupied city of Marj 'Uyun and shelled specifically a group of servicemen from the Swedish contingent of the U.S. force.

It is said here that the actions of the Israeli military represent a glaring violation of the Security Council's resolution and a challenge to the international community.

UN Troop Deployment

LD290911Y Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 78 p 3 LD

[Correspondent K. Geyvandov report: "They Are Dragging Out the Occupation"]

[Text] Beirut, 26 March--Enormous transport aircraft are constantly landing at Beirut international airport. They are bringing contingents of troops from various UN member countries intended to monitor implementation of the Security Council decision on withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied territory in southern Lebanon. They include Frenchmen, Swedes, Norwegians, Iranians and representatives of other UN member countries.

From Beirut long columns of white-painted trucks bearing fluttering blue UN flags are heading south. In the morning the official Lebanese radio reported that UN forces had taken control of the three main Litani River bridges, beyond which lie the outposts of the Israeli occupying army.

The very fact that UN troops are deployed along the Litani River is giving rise to considerable anxiety among the Lebanese public and press; they believe Israel intends to drag out in any way it can fulfillment of the Security Council decision on withdrawal of aggressor troops from occupied Lebanese territory. Drawing attention to this, the Lebanese newspaper An-NAHAR stresses that Lebanon is insisting on deployment of UN forces on the Lebanese-Israeli border.

In connection with the position taken by Tel Aviv, the Beirut press is casting doubt on the so-called "differences" between the United States and Israel, about which the Western press is now writing. After the recent U.S.-Israeli talks, people here note that the United States clearly has no intention of bringing any pressure to get Israel to alter its aggressive course. "U.S. 'disapproval' of Israel's policy," the newspaper AYK writes, "unless it is backed up by a readiness on the part of the United States to halt deliveries of arms and military equipment to the Zionist state, is tantamount to U.S. blessing on the Israeli occupation of Arab lands." The Lebanese press is calling for the mobilization of world public opinion to put pressure on Israel with a view to its immediate implementation of the UN Security Council decision on the withdrawal of the occupation forces from Lebanese land.

The situation in Lebanon remains alarming. Despite the Tel Aviv authorities statements concerning a cease-fire, the Israeli Army, we were told at PLO headquarters, is constantly firing on the city of An-Nabatiyah, the region of Kawkaba, a bridge over the Litani, and other targets beyond the territories in which the aggressors are entrenched.

USSR Relief Supplies

LD281452Y Moscow TASS in English 1442 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Moscow, March 28 TASS--The Executive Committee of the Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of the USSR is to send free of charge relief supplies to the civilian population, victims of Israel's aggression in the south of Lebanon. Medicines and dressing materials are to be sent shortly from Moscow to the Palestine Red Crescent Society in Beirut.

Israeli Goals

LD281141Y Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Mar 78 p 5 LD

[Pavel Demchenko commentary: "The Aggressor Must Leave"]

[Text] Having made a piratical attack on Lebanon, the Israeli Army has occupied the southern part of that country over a total area of approximately 2,000 square km. Dozens of villages and many Palestinian camps have been reduced to ruins, and the ancient city of Tyre has suffered serious damage.

The military operations have not been limited to southern Lebanon. The Israeli Air Force has made missile and bombing strikes on the city of Ad-Damur and the Sabre Palestinian camp near Beirut. Hundreds of peaceful inhabitants have died.

It is quite definitely possible to draw the conclusion that the attack on Lebanon had long been in preparation and pursued definite aims. These were, above all, to extend the zone of Israeli occupation of Arab lands and to strike a blow at the PLO and the Lebanese national progressive forces.

It is well known that Israel's ruling circles are opposed to granting the Arab people of Palestine the right to self-determination and to create their own state. This is precisely why Tel Aviv has long been seeking to weaken and liquidate the PLO, which heads the struggle of the Palestinian people.

These designs coincide with the interestsoof imperialist states as well as reactionary Arab, including Lebanese, circles, which fear the revolutionary character of the Palestinians and the national patriotic forces that act in alliance with them. It is no accident, therefore, that armed detachments of rightists in Lebanon have not only not resisted the aggressors but in places have even acted in conjunction with them. In point of fact they have helped Israel to occupy part of the country, which the aggressor is in no hurry at all to leave. M. Gur, chief of the Israeli General Staff, made this understood quite openly by declaring that the duration of the Israeli presence in southern Lebanon "depends on a very great number of factors." People in Tel Aviv declare in plain terms that the troops will be withdrawn from Lebanon only in exchange for certain concessions and that the Israeli prime minister will be discussing this in Washington during the talks being held there.

It is thus becoming clear that Israel's ruling circles are counting on using the captured Lebanese lands as a means of pressuring Arab states and are complicating the already dangerously explosive situation in the Near East, thereby erecting new obstacles in the way of settling the protracted crisis in that part of the world. The interests of establishing a just peace in the Near East demand that the Israeli troops cease their aggression and immediately withdraw from Lebanese territory, as well as from all the Arab lands occupied since 1967.

Israeli Genocide

LD281601Y Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 78 Morning Edition p 3 LD

[Political commentator V. Kudryavtsev article: "The Palestinians' Just Cause"]

[Text] The Arab people of Palestine, who have been driven from their native land, are being subjected to unprecedented violence by the Israeli aggressors and their imperialist patrons. This violence extends not only to those who, weapons in hand, are defending their legitimate national rights but also to old men, women and children. It is a case of real genocide. Nothing can conceal it now, after the Israeli Armed Forces' unprecedentedly brutal attack on Lebanon. Events in southern Lebanon have shown the whole world particularly graphically that in striking against the Palestine resistance movement the Israeli aggressor is at the same time striking at all Arab people. Nor do bombs and shells spare the Lebanese people. We should pity totally innocent "incidental" victims, even if there are tens, hundreds or thousands of them! Such is the logic of the imperialist aggressor.

There is no justification for the Israeli Zionists' barbaric act. The 11 March incident near Tel Aviv was not the result of anyone's malice. It was the direct result of the position of Israel, which is reluctant to normalize relations in the Near East and is seeking to reinforce the results of the 1967 aggression. [paragraph continues]

Tel Aviv not only refuses to liberate the Arab lands it has seized but will not even hear of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people--rights that Israel itself has flouted. But the patience of the Arab people of Palestine is not boundless, and they have the right to protection and to return to their homes. And you really need the shamelessness of an aggressor to not only take the Palestinian people's land and homes but also appropriate the "right" to wage a one-sided war and use an incident to justify armed invasion of Lebanese territory, thus challenging not only Lebanon but also the United Nations and the whole world.

Israel is not only pursuing its policy of genocide in practice but is also reinforcing it through legislation. Before the start of the armed attack against Lebanon the Israeli Knesset (parliament) adopted a resolution calling for a merciless struggle against the PLO and the physical destruction of its leaders. After that, what is the worth of the Israeli Zionists' false moans about "acts of terrorism" which they see in the peoples' resistance to their diktat? The Knesset's decision is legitimized terror promoted to the rank of state policy. This decision is a slap in the face of the bourgeois democracy in which the hypocritical champions of "human rights" take such pride. This slap in the face is also resounding loudly within the walls of the U.S. Capitol, for the "champions" there have not uttered a word about the pernicious and shameful symbiosis which the Israeli parliament has established between bourgeois democracy and terrorist genocide. On the contrary, U.S. ruling circles have very favorably viewed the actions of their Israeli subordinates, who are trampling upon the rights not of an individual but an entire nation.

It would seem that the Israeli people, who very recently passed through Hitler's unprecedented genocide, should respect other peoples whose legitimate national interests are being flouted by the imperialists. But reality shows that it is not a case of the character of a particular people but of the social system and conditions in which they live. And how can we fail to recall here the hypocritical noise raised in the West and Israel with regard to the UN decision assessing Zionism as a form of racism.

The Arab people of Palestine are setting examples of courage and self-sacrifice for the resurrection of their motherland. In their struggle they are setting the noble aim of restoring their legitimate national rights, including the right to create an independent state on Palestinian soil and the right to return to their homes. By their struggle they have placed themselves in the vanguard of the Arab national liberation movement. Under the conditions created in the Near East, the Arab people of Palestine, whether some poeple like it or not, are the most consistent and inplacable fighters against the Israeli aggressors and the imperialists. To create their own state they must struggle selflessly for the withdrawal of the Israeli Armed Forces from occupied Arab territories. And this coincides with the all-Arab task of liberating all territories occupied by Israel. A just settlement in the Near East as a whole cannot be achieved without this condition. Consequently, in supporting the Palestinian people's struggle, the Arab countries are also defending their own interests.

The Egyptian rulers--while pursuing a capitulationist policy, striking at Arab anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist unity and betraying the cause of the Palestinian people--are at the same time alleging that Egypt is still the leading Arab country. Here they refer to the extent of its territory, the size of its population and its military strength. It has never even occurred to them that the weight and role of a particular country are determined not by these formal indicators; everything is decided by a country's political system and the orientation of its policy. The barometer of current Egyptian policy is Cairo's attitude toward the Palestinian resistance movement and the PLO. Cairo is talking a lot about the defense of Palestinian interests but in fact it is betraying these interests--something which is expressed in particular in the direct persecution of Palestinians, particularly since the Egyptian act of provocation in Cyrpus. The Palestinian movement is enduring this test too, although it is not abandoning the hope that Egypt will return to the pan-Arab family.

The Palestinian people are suffering harsh trials in the present Near East situation. Near Eastern affairs are complex and contradictory. But events show that the Palestinian people are full of faith in their own powers and their ability to regain their motherland and national rights. They are part of the progressive forces of the world, and their struggle for a just settlement in the Near East is a valuable contribution to the consolidation of these forces.

The Soviet Union, Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, said in a talk with Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, invariably acts and will continue to act on the side of the just cause of the Arab people of Palestine, who are staunchly struggling for their freedom and national independence.

Therefore we Soviet people firmly believe that the Arab people of Palestine will emerge honorably from the trials that have been their lot. The victory of their just and noble cause is historically inevitable.

Damascus Conference Communique

LD281537Y Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Mar 78 p 5 LD

[Text] Damascus, 21 March--A conference of foreign and defense ministers of the member countries of the front of progressive Arab states, to which Syria, Algeria, Libya, Democratic Yemen and also the PLO belong, has ended here.

The consequences of Israel's aggression in southern Lebanon were discussed during the work of the conference, the final communique states. A number of practical actions were outlined with a view to securing universal condemnation of Israel's aggression and the immediate, complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanese territory.

The conference participants confirmed their support for Lebanon's sovereignty and expressed readiness to assist the Palestine resistance movement in the military, political and other spheres.

The communique points to the need to repulse the imperialist and Zionist plans directed against the Palestinian resistance movement and the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine to return to their native lands, to self-determination and to create their own state.

The conference rejected a proposal to convene an Arab summit conference with the participation of Egyptian President as-Sadat, who bears responsibility for the exacerbation of the situation in the Near East, and condemned the stand taken by the Egyptian leadership with regard to Israel's aggression in southern Lebanon.

The conference decisions hail the fortitude of the Lebanese people and of the detachments of the Palestinian resistance movement, which are waging a courageous struggle against the aggressor. Recent events have reaffirmed, the communique points out, that there can be no peace in the Near East without the restoration of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

The conference participants evaluated highly the position of states and progressive forces which have condemned Israel's aggression.

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

RHODESIAN INTERNAL SETTLEMENT REJECTED BY NEIGHBOR STATES

LD281856Y Moscow in English to Africa 1500 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Commentary by observer Andrey Dolgov]

[Text] The presidents of the frontline states--Tanzania, Zambia, Mozambique and Botswana--have completed their 2-day conference in Dar es Salaam. In their communique they rejected the so-called internal settlement agreement signed in Rhodesia and reaffirmed support for the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front and the armed struggle it leads. Radio Moscow observer Andrey Dolgov makes this comment: It's only natural, he writes, that first the Organization of African Unity, then the United Nations Security Council and now the four frontline states have denounced and rejected the internal settlement between Smith on the one side and Muzorewa, Sithole and Chirau on the other. All this boils down to the intention to impose a puppet regime on the Zimbabwe people. By their decision, independent Africa and international communities have contributed to a further political isolation of participants in the deal. The seriousness of this step has been understood by the Anglo-American diplomacy, which in actual fact has been accepting the situation that has emerged in Rhodesia step-by-step.

The position of the frontline states is of paramount importance for, being in the forefront of the struggle for liberation in southern Africa, these states can exert the most immediate effect on the evolution of the situation in Rhodesia. Aware of that fact, the Western powers have been trying to exert pressure to bear not only on the Patriotic Front but also upon the frontline states, acting through the international fund or through their emissaries, like the American United Nations ambassador, Andrew Young. He was urgently sent to the conference in Dar es Salaam to join forces with the British and U.S. ambassadors to win the African leaders over. But the plan failed. The presidents of the frontline states did not change their position of principle, and refused to accept any form of the internal settlement which leads to the creation of a pseudo-independent puppet state. Neither did Andrew Young succeed with his provocative allegations about the possibility of a Soviet-Cuban interference in the Rhodesian conflict. Such allegations aren't new. They are made to isolate the liberation movement from the socialist states that vigorously support the just cause of the nations in southern Africa. The conference in Dar es Salaam rejected the efforts of Washington and London to make the [words indistinct] negotiations with the participants in the Salisbury deal. The African leaders called on the West to stop playing hide-and-seek and to adopt a clearcut position concerning the collusion between Smith and the puppets.

The Dar es Salaam communique describes the deal as an ominous maneuver aimed at splitting the Zimbabwe liberation movement. The integrity and consistency of the frontline states' policy are the chief result of the conference in Dar es Salaam. It was also a reliable guarantee for the victory of freedom fighters and for the transfer of power to the genuine representatives of the Zimbabwe people in Rhodesia.

African Press Comment

LD281826Y Moscow TASS in English 1724 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Moscow, March 28, TASS--The attempts of the Salisbury authorities to create, with the help of traitors of the Zimbabwe people, a puppet regime, defending the interests of the white minority and Western monopolies operating in Rhodesia, encounter mounting condemnation by free Africa. Meanwhile, the Western press does not conceal satisfaction with the latest manoeuvres of the racists' ringleader, Smith.

Maputo. The deal struck by a handful of racists with representatives of the innumerous African bourgeoisie, writes the Mozambique newspaper NOTICIAS, has the aim to preserve brutal exploitation of the African majority, to save the regime in the face of growing economic and military difficulties.

The Mozambique people, the newspaper stresses, reaffirms its unconditional support for the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front, which fights for elimination of the illegal Salisbury regime and for creation of a genuinely independent and free state.

Lagos. Nigeria's federal commissioner for foreign affairs, Joseph Carba, on behalf of the government of his country, expressed readiness to continue giving support of the just liberation struggle waged by the Zimbabwe patriots.

He noted that formation of a puppet regime under Smith's aegis is an illegal act, like the seizure of power in that African country by a group of white settlers in 1965.

Lusaka. Commenting on the stand of the United States and Britain in the Rhodesian issue, the newspaper TIMES OF ZAMBIA points out that there is every indication that these countries should like to see the power in Rhodesia being left in the hands of the racist minority for all time, though the African majority in no uncertain terms turns down the Smith-Pattern "settlement." The Zimbabwe people will gain independence only in the course of armed liberation struggle under the leadership of the Patriotic Front, stresses TIMES OF ZAMBIA.

London. The British newspaper DAILY TELEGRAPH openly welcomes the formation in Rhodesia of a new puppet regime, headed by white minority leader Smith. This regime, the newspaper points out, looks much better from the viewpoint of Western interests than from any other viewpoint. Britain and America should find ways of giving it all-round assistance, to see to it that all the "free world" should give its backing to the regime.

Front Leader Interviewed

LD282338Y Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2130 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] George Silundika, a leader of the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front was in Moscow recently. Our correspondent Vadim Logov comments: George Silundika has dedicated his whole life to the fight against the racists. He is an organizer of the political and armed struggle for independence by the peoples of Zimbabwe against the Smith regime. I asked him to tell us about the agreement signed in Salisbury concerning the so-called 'internal solution' to the Rhodesian crisis.

[Silundika speaking in English fading into Russian translation] The internal solution, George Silundika says, which Ian Smith, the head of the racists, and the puppets, Mozorewa, Sithole and Chirau, are trying to foist off on the people of Zimbabwe is aimed at defending the economic interests of foreign monopolies who are exploiting our country, and preserving the racist regime in Rhodesia. Smith's objective is to attract some traitors to his side, traitors who would serve him, and with their help create the illusion of a transfer of power into the hands of the Africans. The intention of the Rhodesian racists to impose the neocolonialist solution has received the support of their Western guardians, Great Britain and the United States. The Patriotic Front opposes any compromises with the racists and their puppets. In response to the racist's plots, we intend to strengthen the liberation struggle.

My next question to Silundika was: In what way is the neocolonialist character of this agreement revealed?

The agreement in Salisbury guarantees no change in the colonial and economic system, George Silundika said, and also leaves intact the regime's repressive apparatus, the army and police. The white racists, according to the agreement, can influence any important decisions of parliament including the question of amendments to the Constitution. In other words, everything remains against which we are waging our struggle.

NIGERIAN ENVOY REQUESTS SANCTIONS AGAINST S. AFRICA

LD281712Y Moscow TASS in English 1607 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Lusaka, March 28, TASS--The racialist regime can exist only due to the support of the Western powers in the south of Africa, said Leslie Harriman, chairman of the U.N Special Committee Against Apartheid, Nigerian permanent representative at the U.N.O., who is currently staying here. He declared for all-embracing sanctions against the racialist regime of the South African republic, including a ban on arms and oil supplies and financial aid. The Nigerian representative stressed the great significance of the U.N. decision to announce 1978 the year of international struggle against apartheid. This decision, he said, will make it possible to step up the activity of world public in the struggle against racialism and in support of the righteous cause of the peoples of the south of Africa.

U.S. CAPITAL HEAVILY ENTRENCHED IN SOUTH AFRICA

LD281230Y Moscow TASS in English 1140 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Maputo, March 28, TASS--The growing economic, financial and military ties between the West, especially the USA, and the South Africa racist regime are seen by the African public as evidence of a collusion between imperialism and racism against the forces of freedom and progress in Africa. While condemning in words apartheid, the US Government and monopoly circles are doing everything they can to strengthen the white minority regime, and hamper efforts to achieve complete international isolation of this regime. According to U.N. figures, 26,600 American companies are actively at work in South Africa. They hold a dominant position in the automobile, electronic, electrical and oil industries. It is said in the U.N. documents that American capital investments in South Africa totalled last year about 2 billion dollars and trade with South Africa ran, according to American press reports, at over 2.5 billion dollars. The list of big American businesses on which the Vorster regime rests, includes Mobile Oil, Caltex, Exxon, Socal, General Motors, Ford Motor, Crysler, Control Data, International Business Machines.

Many U.S. banks have their branches in South Africa. The leading place among them is held by Chase Manhattan Bank which finances civil and military construction. The International Monetary Fund which is controlled by U.S. financial circles, has granted 463 million dollars in loans to the racist regime over the last two years. The United States' actions in supporting the racist regimes greatly alarm and are sharply criticized by the African and world public as well as various circles in the USA. American capital and credits, says Senator R. Clark in the New York TIMES, are playing a decisive part in encouraging the South African authorities to pursue a still tougher racist policy.

Big business intends to go ahead with this policy. According to H. Ford, president of the board of directors of Ford Motor Company, who visited recently Pretoria, the American firms have no intention of leaving South Africa and hope to cooperate fruitfully with the South African regime. A spokesman of General Motors which got over 200 million dollars by selling its products to the Pretoria regime last year, also stated categorically that his corporation has been staying in South Africa for over a halfcentury and that it has no intention of leaving.

IMPERIALISTS, REACTIONARIES STILL TRYING TO SPLIT ETHIOPIA

LD282010Y Moscow in English to Africa 1630 GMT 28 Mar 78 ID

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] It was announced in Addis Ababa that Ethiopia's armed forces and people's militia have restored full control over the country's southern and southeastern regions, which were occupied by the Somalian troops. Life in the liberated regions is gradually coming back to normal. Refugees are returning to towns and villages. The authorities are giving them the necessary assistance. The roar of battle no longer reigns in the [word indistinct] region.

But the enemies of revolutionary Ethiopia don't intend to leave it alone. After the failure of the aggression in the eastern part of Ethiopia, imperialists and their yes men began harboring new plans for interference in its internal affairs. Imperialist and reactionary Arab circles are increasing aid to the separatist elements in Eritrea in a bid to undermine the country's unity and deprive of the access to the Red Sea. They have no scruples that Eritrea is an inalienable part of Ethiopia. The nation inherited the Eritrean problem from the feudal and monarchist past. As the ETHIOPIAN HERALD put it, this problem, and the nationalities question in general, can be solved only on the class basis within the framework of the program of the national democratic revolution.

The schemes of the imperialists and reactionaries to isolate Ethiopia and undermine the revolution there have given birth to their other plan--that of Somalia annexing all or part of the Republic of Djibouti. The plan was recently exposed in an official statement in Addis Ababa by a Foreign Ministry spokesman. It has become known that this scheme was discussed at last week's talks in Mogadiscio between the American assistant secretary of state for African affairs, Richard Moose, and the Somali leaders.

CHAD GOVERNMENT, FROLINAT HOLD TALKS IN LIBYA

LD251454Y Moscow TASS in English 1331 GMT 25 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Tripoli, March 25, TASS--Talks between representatives of the government of the Republic of Chad and the National Liberation Front of Chad (FROLINAT) are being held in the Libyan town of Sabha with the mediation of Niger, Sudan and Libya.

The talks discussed normalisation of the political situation in Chad, ending of the war in the north of the country between FROLINAT insurgents and the central government, implementation of the national reconciliation programme proclaimed by president of the republic, Felix Malloum.

An official spokesman said that the talks proceed successfully. The sides managed to bring closer the viewpoints of the Chad Government and FROLINAT on the questions discussed, above all on the problem of national unity.

USSR-DPRK CULTURAL AGREEMENT SIGNED IN MOSCOW

SF290938Y Moscow in Korean to Korea 0950 GMT 28 Mar 78 SK

[Text] A Soviet-DPRK cultural exchange agreement for 1978-79 has been signed in Moscow. In this connection, Moscow Radio commentator Petrov comments:

The major provisions in the agreement call for the participation of (?cultural) specialists of both nations and recognition of (?joint anniversaries) in Soviet-DPRK relations. For instance, [word indistinct] will be marked in both nations and exhibitions will be held in (?Great October) and on the anniversary of the founding of the DPRK.

[Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 27 March at 1750 GMT adds the following: On 27 March, Zemskov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, and Kim Chae-poing, DPRK ambassador to the USSR, signed a plan for cultural exchange between the two countries for 1978-79.]

According to the agreement, famed Russian art troupes such as the (?Northern) Russian People's Chorus and the (Zagorskiy) ballet troupe of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will visit the DPRK. At the same time, the DPRK will send its art troupes to our country. In addition, a DPRK delegation will participate in the 6th Tchaikovskiy International Music Contest to be held in Moscow this year.

The cooperation between filmmakers of the two nations will be active. Both sides will exchange delegations and films, discuss matters of concern and study film materials through (?seminars), thus further developing (?the seminars). The agreement foresees that the DPRK delegation will participate in the international film festivals to be held in Tashkent and Moscow. At the same time, [word indistinct] of the Soviet National Film Preservation Office, members of the Film Arts Committee, and technicians of the Film History Research Institute will visit the DPRK. Cooperation between creative groups of the two nations will continue. In this area, the architectural leagues of the Soviet Union and the DPRK, and the National Intellectual Association of the Soviet Union and the Industrial-Technological Functionary Association of the DPRK will exchange delegations.

Lomanosov University of Moscow, Leningrad Engineering College, Kim Il-song University and Kimchaek Engineering College will exchange students, researchers, research assistants and scientific materials and texts. It is also expected that collaboration between the two nations in the fields of radio, television and [word indistinct] will be expanded. The 1978-79 Soviet-DPRK cultural exchange agreement concluded in Moscow will contribute to further consolidating the fraternal collaboration between the Soviet Union and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

JCP OPPOSITION TO U.S. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NOTED

OW281115Y Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1400 GMT 27 Mar 78 OW

[Text] The JCP has protested the construction by the U.S. military of a control center in Japan to guide the navigation of aircraft, warships and submarines. In a statement addressed to Prime Minister Fukuda, the JCP dietmen stressed that expansion of the network of U.S. military installations in Japan will further involve the nation in the U.S. strategy in the Far East.

BREZHNEV DEPARTS FOR TOUR OF SIBERIA, SOVIET FAR EAST

LD281800Y Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1705 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Text] Moscow--Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, left Moscow today on a journey during which he will visit a number of towns in Siberia and the Far East. Leonid Brezhnev is accompanied on his trip by Dmitriy Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, and by Leonid Zamyatin, department head at the CPSU Central Committee.

Leonid Brezhnev was seen off by members of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee Andropov, Gromyko, Kirilenko, Kosygin, Kulakov and Mazurov; candidate members of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee Demichev, Solomentsev and Chernenko; secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee Kapitonov, Dolgikh, Ryabov and Rusakov; members of the CPSU Central Committee Bugayev, Pavlov, Tsukanov and Shchelokov; candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Aleksandrov, Tsvigun, Tsinev and Chebrikov; member of the CPSU Central Auditing Committee Blatov; Minister of Railways Pavlovskiy; and aide to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Samoteykin.

REPORT ON KOSYGIN'S 22-24 MAR VISIT TO TYUMEN, TOMSK

LD290949Y Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Mar 78 p 2 LD

[Text] TASS--A.N. Kosygin member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, was in Tyumenskaya and Tomskaya oblasts on 22-24 March. He visited a number of enterprises and participated in conferences of leaders of party and soviet oblast organizations and specialists of the petroleum, gas and petrochemical industries. Questions concerning the long-term development of the Tyumenskaya and Tomskaya oblast economies were examined.

At a meeting of the Tyumenskaya Oblast party, soviet and economic aktiv, A.N. Kosygin described the work underway in the country on the implementation of tasks set forth in the 25th CPSU Congress decisions and the speech by L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at the party Central Committee's December (1977) Plenum.

Comrade A.N. Kosygin and his entourage left for Krasnoyarsk on 24 March.

ANNIVERSARY OF GORKIY'S BIRTH OBSERVED IN MOSCOW

LD281850Y Moscow TASS in English 1817 GMT 28 Mar 78 LD

[Excerpt] Moscow, March 28, TASS--The 110th anniversary of the birth of the great proletarian writer, the founder of socialist realism Maxim Gorkiy has become a great date of the multinational Soviet literature. A celebration meeting was held at the Moscow Art Academic Theatre of the USSR today to mark this significant date. Present at the meeting here Petr Demichev, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of culture of the USSR, leaders of intellectual unions prominent workers in literature and art, representatives of the public.

A speech about Gorkiy was made by Vadim Kozhevnikov, secretary of the board of the Writers' Union of the USSR. The writer's famous words about man, his lofty mission, which were prophetically uttered early this century, have never been so convincing as now when the Soviet people, guided by the Communist Party, reached unprecedented economic, cultural and intellectual development, Kozhevnikov said.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

DAILY REPORT volumes are published Monday through Friday in both paper version (mailed daily) and microfiche version (mailed weekly). Annual subscription including occasional supplements is, for the first volume, $125 paper/$100 fiche; each additional area volume up to seven, $70 paper/$60 fiche; all eight volumes $575 paper/$500 fiche. Foreign subscription for the first volume $160 paper/$125 fiche; each additional area volume up to seven, $70 paper/$60 fiche; all eight volumes for $610 paper/$525 fiche. Each additional paper or fiche subscription beyond eight is $50. The volumes are: I—People's Republic of China; II—Eastern Europe; III—Soviet Union; IV—Asia & Pacific; V—Middle East & North Africa; VI—Latin America; VII—Western Europe; VIII—Sub-Saharan Africa. Back issues or single copies are not available. Allow 30 days for processing new subscriptions. Mail remittances, inquiries, and address changes to the NTIS address below.

Note: The publications of the Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS), which are sometimes cited in the DAILY REPORT, can also be ordered from NTIS in single copies or by subscription. In ordering, please cite the JPRS title, number, date, and author if applicable.

Both the DAILY REPORT and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at public and university libraries throughout the United States.

NTIS

National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Springfield, Virginia 22151